EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/empireclubofcana1935unse

J. H. BRACE, ESQ.

President of the Empire Club of Canada, 1935-36

EMPIRE CLUB
OF
CANADA

ADDRESSES DELIVERED TO THE
MEMBERS DURING THE
YEAR 1935-1936

Thirty-third Year of Issue

CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

GOD SAVE THE KING

TORONTO:
PRINTERS GUILD, LIMITED

Copyright, Canada, 1936
The Empire Club of Canada

Printed in Canada

PRINTERS GUILD, LIMITED
TORONTO, ONT.

CONTENTS

PAGE

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE vii

ADDRESSES:

LUNCHEON MEETING—THE AUSTRALIAN SITUATION 1
THE RIGHT HON. J. A. LYONS, P.C., M.P.

THE SYMBOL OF ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION 19
RT. HON. SIR BOYD (FRANK) MERRIMAN

EDUCATION AND THE FUTURE OF CIVILIZATION 29
MR. E. SALTER DAVIES, C.B.E., M.A.

ETHIOPIA AND ITS PROBLEMS 42
REV. DR. S. A. B. MERCER

VOICES ACROSS THE SEA 56
DR. J. O. PERRINE

GERMANY PREPARES FOR CONQUEST 75
LT.-COL. GEO. A. DREW, V.D., A.D.C.

SOCIAL CREDIT 92
MR. C. R. SANDERSON, B.SC.

BRITAIN'S NEW RESPONSIBILITIES 110
MRS. JOHN F. DAVIDSON, M.A.

THE NEW ALIGNMENTS IN EUROPE 120
MR. HARRISON BROWN

THE ART OF LIVING 131
HIS EXCELLENCY, LORD TWEEDSMUIR

THE ART THAT CONCEALS ART 140
MR. CLEMENT MAY

OUR PRESENT PERPLEXITIES 156
HON. MR. JUSTICE R. A. E. GREENSHIELDS

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF MY STAY IN ENGLAND 169
HON. G. HOWARD FERGUSON

AN UNOFFICIAL FRENCHMAN'S VIEW OF THE EUROPEAN SITUATION 181
PROFESSOR FERNAND BALDENSPERGER

IMPACT OF WORLD FORCES IN THE FAR EAST 193
MR. JOHN W. BEATON

ROADS TO THE FUTURE 209
MR. JOHN W. DAFOE, LL.D., F.R.S.C.

OUR NATIONAL TASK 221
MR. JOHN M. IMRIE

PAGE

WHAT AVIATION MEANS TO CANADA 235
AIR VICE-MARSHAL W. A. BISHOP, V.C., D.S.O., M.C., D.F.C., ETC.

JOTTINGS FROM AN EXPLORER'S NOTEBOOK 253
CAPT. CARL VON HOFFMAN

STRATOSPHERE EXPLORATION 265
CAPT. ALBERT W. STEVENS, AIR CORPS U.S.A.

THE COUNTRY DOCTOR IN NORTHERN ONTARIO 277
DR. ALLAN ROY DAFOE, O.B.E.

THE TRAIL OF '35 295
MR. CHARLES CAMSELL, C.M.G., LL.D., F.R.S.C.

CANADA'S PROBLEMS IN RELIEF AND ASSISTANCE 306
MISS CHARLOTTE WHITTON, C.B.E., M.A.

INDIA AND THE EMPIRE 321
LT.-GEN. SIR WM. EDMUND IRONSIDE, K.C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.

CONDITIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA 334
MR. ALBERT G. PARTRIDGE

KIPLING, THE POET OF EMPIRE 350
REV. DR. GEO. C. PIDGEON

THE NEXT FIVE YEARS IN CANADA 365
MR. FLOYD S. CHALMERS

THE GREATNESS OF THE GREAT LAKES 381
MR. WM. GANSON ROSE

TO THE TOP OF THE WORLD WITH THE EASTERN ARCTIC PATROL 396
HON. W. G. MARTIN

ANNUAL MEETING 416

ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT 421

HONORARY AND PAST PRESIDENTS 422

CONSTITUTION 423
INSTITUTED 1903.

HONORARY AND LIFE MEMBERS 428

RESIDENT MEMBERS 428

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS 439

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE

YEAR 1935-36

Patron:

FIELD MARSHAL H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND STRATHEARN, K.G., G.C.M.G.

Honorary President:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD TWEEDSMUIR, G.C.M.G., C.H.

President: J. H. Brace, Esq.
First Vice President: H. C. Bourlier, Esq.
Second Vice President: J. S. P. Armstrong, Esq.
Third Vice President: F. B. Matthews, Esq.
Honorary Secretary: H. F. Powell, Esq.
Honorary Treasurer: Howard Webster, Esq.

Executive Committee:

Major Gordon B. Balfour, K.C.
F. H. Barlow, Esq., K.C.
John D. Cameron, Esq.
Geo. D. Davis, Esq.
Lt.-Col. Geo. A. Drew
F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, Esq., K.C.
Geo. C. Gale, Esq.
R. M. Harcourt, Esq.
W. M. Hargraft, Esq.
Main Johnson, Esq.
R. V. LeSueur, Esq.
Wm. A. H. MacBrien, Esq.
J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.
B. K. Sandwell, Esq.
A. Graham Stewart, Esq.
E. F. Thompson, Esq.
Graeme Watson, Esq.

Immediate Past President: Dana H. Porter, Esq.

Past Presidents:

Hugh S. Eayrs, Esq.
Robert Fennel, Esq.
Col. Alexander Fraser

LUNCHEON MEETING

AN ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE J. A. LYONS, P.C., M.P., PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA.

Friday, July 12*th,* 1935.

The Empire Club of Canada joined with the other Luncheon and Service Clubs of Toronto in a special meeting on Friday, July 12th, 1935, at which the guest of honour was the Right Honourable J. A. Lyons, P.C., M.P., Prime Minister of Australia.

The Right Honourable J. A. Lyons was introduced by the Prime Minister of Ontario, the Honourable Mitchell F. Hepburn.

PREMIER HEPBURN: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I want to thank my good friend, the Chairman, for the kind invitation which has enabled me to be present to-day in order that I may discharge the pleasant duty that now falls upon me.

This is indeed an important and auspicious occasion. Important, inasmuch as I believe this is the most representative gathering of Toronto citizens that has ever assembled under one roof; auspicious, in that we have as our guest speaker to-day one of the outstanding statesmen of the great British Empire.

This morning I had the privilege of receiving the Premier of Australia at my office at Queen's Park, at which time I introduced him to my cabinet colleagues, and in view of the fact that the one of whom I am going to speak at the present moment is in the room, I am going to let you in on a state secret. Naturally, I expected my friend, the Honourable Peter Heenan would be the first friend on the receiving end. To my disappointment he landed quite late. I found later he had got in the big parade to-day and as a matter of fact, he had to park his car six blocks from the office and from there he marched in the Orange Parade to the tune of "The Protestant Boys". He explained that in his anxiety he was prepared to do anything because he wanted to meet an Australian or a New Zealander. He said, "They have changed the whole course of my life. If it had not been for Australian and New Zealand butter I would today have been Minister of Labour in the King Government instead of Emperor of the North in the administration over which you preside." (Laughter).

During the course of our conversation I gathered that the sister Dominion of Australia has very much the same political problems as we have. Australia is going through the same period of economic evolution, but I must say, in all humility, it appears to me Australia has made a little more progress toward rehabilitation than we have and today we are going to have the privilege of hearing from his own lips the story of how this was accomplished. We are going to hear from the lips of the man who is chiefly responsible for the enviable position which Australia occupies at the present time.

Mr. Lyons started in as the Premier of a relatively small province, Tasmania, and later he accepted the larger responsibility of leading an administration in the Commonwealth of Australia. His rise in public life has been phenomenal. The service that he has rendered to his own people, I know, is appreciated over there and we know, as a result of the interchange of ideas today, some good will accrue to those of us who are here to welcome him.

So, I say, we appreciate his presence, the presence of a man who has rendered great service to his own country, the presence of a distinguished citizen of the British Empire to which we all pledge our allegiance, and who, above all, is a mighty good fellow. And I hope, while he is here within our country, he will enjoy the fullest measure of Canadian hospitality.

I now have great pleasure in introducing to you the Prime Minister of our sister Dominion, Australia.
(Hearty applause accompanied by three cheers for the Prime Minister of Australia).

The Right Honourable J. A. Lyons: Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen: You have given me an extraordinarily cordial welcome to this part of the Dominion and it is only in keeping with the welcomes that we have already received before we reached Toronto. It might just be we will want to come back again and I hope that one day that may be possible because I believe that an interchange of visits between those who represent the various Dominions of the Empire and, indeed, between those who represent the various countries of the world, must have something of real value to those we represent.

You apparently are under the impression that because you have a Trade Representative of Australia here who happens to be a Queenslander, that the right sort of temperature to provide for an Australian representative is one that would suit Mr. MacGregor and the State from which he comes. I am afraid he hasn't told you enough about Australia. He must have told you too much about Queensland, because some of us live so near the South Pole that we could do without some of the warmth and some of the humidity that is in the temperature and the climate we have been passing through recently. However, that warmth is utterly in keeping with the warmth of the welcome we have received.

Now, we are representing here today, you and we who come from Australia, two important units in the great Empire of which we are so proud to be members and it has been a very great privilege to me to be associated with you through your Prime Minister of the Dominion in the celebrations that have taken place recently in London. The great unifying influence of the head of our Empire, of the King, himself, is one that is valued and appreciated by you and by us away out in Australia. Apart from the freedom we enjoy as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, we do enjoy it and we value it. Apart from that, we have the wonderful example that the King and the Queen have set to all of us, just as individuals, just as members of their family and it is because of that we have developed an affection and a loyalty that spreads right through the Empire and in a world where countries and peoples, generally, are no longer placing any very great value on kings and thrones and crowns, the loyalty and the love of the people of the Empire for their king and their throne and their crown is more intense, I think, than it ever has been in its history.

You people of Canada and the people of Australia that I represent have many things in common. We are neighbours because the Pacific doesn't separate us; it unites us and we are bound together by ties of trade. We are hoping that we shall get closer and closer together as the years go by and the development of the methods of transport and communication must bring us closer and closer. When we think of trade, for instance, we are hoping and we not only hope but we ask that the Dominion that has done so much to provide the transport between Australia and Canada will provide better transport, more up to date and modern transport as time goes by, so that trade may grow with the method of transport. The develpoment in the air will bring us closer together. I not only hope but I am absolutely sure that we shall see in the near future developments in that direction that will bring us very much closer together than we are today, and I think it will be well for the world because I believe this Empire of ours is destined to play an important part for the world, for the people of the world, for the peace of the world, and to exercise a great influence in the development of the world in the future generations.

Now, our trade with you people is very important to you and very vital to us. We have had treaties with Canada from 1825 to 1931 and the result of those treaties has been to develop our trade. You have a benefit and we have a benefit. You have the greater benefit. We are not complaining about that, but we ask that an effort be made by Canada, not altogether to balance up because there are circumstances that make that scarcely possible, but that you shall do something to bring the trade balance a little bit nearer, to bring it nearer to a balance, at any rate. And we ask, as we are such good customers of Canada, that you will develop as customers of Australia.

In your last financial year we bought from you $18,000,000 worth and you bought from us, $6,000,000 worth, so that our trade is worth three pounds to you for every pound your trade is worth to us. As I say, we don't hope that that shall balance because there are circumstances that prevent, perhaps, but we do hope the position will be improved from the Australian standpoint. You know, last year we purchased from Canada 208,000,000 feet of Canadian lumber and we bought 12,000,000 pounds of Canadian canned salmon and we bought 100,000 tons of Canadian newsprint and we bought 16,189 Canadian automobiles. In fact, in that year you sold to Australia more automobiles than you have ever sold to any single country within the Empire or outside of the Empire. So, apart from ties of sentiment and of Empire, you realize what a value we are to Canada and how we ought to understand each other and get close together as members of that Empire.

On the other hand, while you don't buy from us so much as we buy from you, you buy commodities that mean success and profit to particular industries and interests in Australia and that is very valuable, indeed, because in difficult times it is well that some interests, at any rate shall be living under decent and profitable conditions and we get a benefit there. For instance, you have bought 12,500 tons of raisins and currants from Australia and that goes a long way to bring some prosperity to the people providing those things and you bought 72,000 gallons of wine. I don't know what you do with that. You bought 4,000,000 pounds of canned fruits and 30,000 tons of raw sugar and 3,000,000 pounds of wool and wool products.

Again I say, while this thing doesn't balance, all the things I point out to you that you buy from us are of very great value to us, indeed, and all we say—we are not complaining at all—is that we are hoping the condition will improve on what it is to-day.

So we discussed this trade question with your Dominion Government and we are hopeful of making progress in this regard. We have always, or practically the whole life of our Federation in Australia, given definite preference to Great Britain in our trade. Back in the days of the great Alfred Beacon, we laid down first a definite margin of preference of five per cent and it has gone on and on until we reached the Ottawa preferences and some of the margins are up to 30 and 35 per cent. And we give preferences to the Empire, too. We believe that is where we should start, though we believe also that trade with the countries of the world is essential to you as to us. We are hopeful of continuing that policy and, as I say, getting closer and closer to the other parts of the Empire.

Now, I don't want to worry you with that trade situation today. We discussed it with your government. I appeal to you gentlemen because you are such a representative gathering here today. When you are making your purchases show a little discrimination sometimes in favour of my country. When you realize what a fine customer that country is in your interests, buy some more Australian goods—even if it is wine, try that out. It's all right. I can answer for that. (Applause.) But do this in order that you may show to the Australian people, Gentlemen, that you appreciate the trade they are doing with you.

Now, your Prime Minister has been kind enough to say kindly things about me and what I have done in Australia. As a matter of fact, I haven't done very much. Whenever a big job is done, it is done by the people as a whole. What Australia has done is the result of sacrifice made by her people at the right time and if I have succeeded in any way at the head of the government, it is not because of anything I have done individually, it is because of the co-operation and the loyalty I have received from my colleagues. I have only one qualification for the position I occupy, that is that I am able to pass my job on to my colleagues who work with me. I do little; they carry the load. The sympathy and the co-operation and the loyalty that they give me makes it possible for me at all times to carry on, and through those colleagues, we pass on our policy to the people and the people take up that policy and say that this may mean a sacrifice, an extra burden we will bear because we think it is necessary. And I have today to pay tribute to every section of the Australian people, high and low, for what they have done and particularly the workers of our country, to those who are at the lower end of the scale who in all times of difficulty have to bear the greatest burden. They have borne it with cheerfulness and courage, characteristic of the Australian people and if a greater tribute is paid to any section, it must be to the workers of that country.

We, for many years were developing our country as you are in Canada. We are still building up or developing and neither you nor we have reached the highest point. Our greatness, I think, as your greatness, lies in the future and we are building foundations which will make possible that greatness in the future. We were going along, developing our country, making use of borrowed money from outside of Australia, making possible the settlement in the various parts of the country. We were building up a national debt which added to our burden of interest, to our annual commitments and I am afraid we were going along sometimes on foundations not too stable and reliable. We didn't look quite far enough into the future. We were happy so long as we could borrow more money and spend it and continue to borrow. Many of the works carried out were productive, making possible the progress of the country. Many of the works we spent money on, I think we are getting no return on today. That is true, I think, of every new country, at any rate, but we have been able to improve the position in recent times. Perhaps, after all, the depression is not an unmixed evil if it brings real lessons to governments. Our interest bill five years ago for instance got up to $325,000,000 a year. We are not 7,000,000 of people out there in Australia and the interest bill was $325,000,000 five years ago. As a result of the things we have done, the plans we have followed in conjunction with the States, the relief we have got in interest following on the conversion of our national debt to a lower rate of interest, we haven't been piling up the national debt in recent times; instead of the $325,000,000 of five years ago, the interest on our national debt today is around $250,000,000. (Applause.)

And to show you the financial stability of our country, I show you that that is the trend in the last five years, lightening the burden and at the same time we have been increasing our contribution towards a sinking fund, the aim of which is, of course, to bring about the extinction or the end of the public debt. In that same period we have increased our contribution to the sinking fund. While the interest debt has been coming down we have increased our contribution to the sinking fund from $30,000,000 to over $40,000,000 in the same period. So we are not only saving the position so far as interest is concerned, but we are making still greater provision against the future and we are insuring to those who invest in Australian stocks real security which is worth while to them as it is worth while to us. Our interest debt today is just about what it was nine years ago. In recent years we dropped but it is just about what it was nine years ago. Our contributions to the sinking fund are just about double what they were nine years ago.

Now, we have done this in a difficult time. We have had to face this depression as you have. Perhaps if we had met the effects a little earlier, it would have been better. We were up against it because all the things we sold from Australia to the world were primary products and you know how primary products suffered in price. So you see the problem of Australia. Our national income was £650,000,000 normally. In about two years, because of the drop in the price of commodities, we produced and sold to the world, we found our national income £200,000,000 less and we had to face all this depression and all its effects with £200,000,000 less money per annum to do it with.

When you look at that you begin to realize what our difficulties were. Well, we were concerned about this position. We had been going on borrowing money, as I said, year by year from London and spending it in Australia. That source of income, if you can call it income, dropped completely because we couldn't borrow any money in London and as a result of our financial position in Australia we couldn't borrow a copper in Australia either.

Through those difficult days when States and Commonwealth each had substantial deficits, year by year, we had to go cap in hand to the trading banks and the Commonwealth banks asking for just enough to carry us on from year to year, for the banks to supply the deficits of government and in addition to find sufficient to keep going a minimum programme of public works to employ some of our people, at any rate. We had to go to the banks because the people in those days didn't trust governments. The people in Australia wouldn't lend anything, no matter what rate of interest we offered and we couldn't raise a copper in London.

Then we approached this thing. I say this to you, we offer no criticism of anything any other country in the world has done. We only tell you the story of what we did in order to get out of that difficulty. I think it is proper that the people in each Dominion should know something of what the other Dominions have done, something of its plans and what it is trying to do. We say that with an income reduced by roughly a third, we couldn't continue on the old basis and we didn't try any fantastic schemes to get out of our troubles. We said that a government is like an individual. If it wants to retain the respect of its neighbours it has got to live within its income and endeavour to balance its budget and cut its coat according to its cloth. (Applause.) So we said, "We have got to ask the people of Australia as a whole to bear an extra burden. We have got to ask the public servants and the pensioners to take something less." That wasn't pleasant for us to propose. We must raise more revenue and therefore increase the taxation on the shoulders, particularly, that are able to bear a bit of extra taxation. We put our taxation up and cut our expenditures down. We went to the bondhouses and we said, "We are asking every other section to do this job. You have got to bear your share of it." So we proposed a conversion loan in Australia of the national debt held in Australia and we asked the bond holders to convert to a lower rate of interest by cutting the interest by 22½ per cent. and over ninety per cent. of the bond holders voluntarily came along and converted their holdings.

At the time that we tackled this problem the Commonwealth of Australia was facing a deficit of $100,000,000 —to put it in your currency. In the year in which they did it the recovery was so great, the confidence so restored in the minds of the people that even in that year the Commonwealth of Australia balanced its budget. And every year that we have been there as a government— it was during the time of the present government that the thing was done, we came in at the end of 1931, and at the end of 1932 the budget was balanced —it has been balanced. We closed our accounts on the 30th of June, the other day, and again we have a surplus of $3,500,000 in the national balanced budget.

So we have done this thing and we are very proud of it. I said we couldn't borrow a penny in Australia at that time. But since then, not only have we converted that loan in Australia on a voluntary basis but we have gone to London and converted a substantial portion of our national debts, especially those with a high rate of interest. London trusts us, too. We converted the debt and we save £20,000,000 a year for the people of the Australian Commonwealth and the States and that has gone a long way towards helping us to balance the budget.

To give an idea of the recovery that has taken place in Australia as a result of this. We haven't got out of the woods, of course, we are a long way from it. We depend on world recovery. Unless the prices of our commodities and yours recover we can't expect complete recovery in Australia but we have made wonderful advances.

We had a huge rate of unemployment, especially in the middle of 1932 and from then on, again because of confidence restored by government, the employment was provided by private enterprise which provides eighty per cent. of our employment.. After all, confidence restored in the minds of the controllers of our industry leads to the beginning of the cutting down of unemployment in every quarter. Since the beginning of 1932 we have seen the position improving and it is improving today.

Then again, there is no better indication of the recovery than this: the railways. The railways are a mighty good indication of where we stand. Of course for very many years past our railways which are owned by the government have provided facilities, perhaps private companies wouldn't undertake to provide, because we do it from the national standpoint to develop a district, whether the district will pay immediately or not. It doesn't matter; we do it for the purpose of national development. As a result we lost on our railways substantially. We lost that in the national interest. Last year the improvement in the railway position was this, that the losses on the Australian railways as a whole were less last year than they have been since 1925 and they were less last year in the actual losses upon the railways compared with 1931. There was definitely a two-thirds reduction to the loss that has taken place between 1931 and 1934.

Then, again the confidence that has been restored has enabled us not only to go to the Australian market to raise our money—we do that for all new works, we raise the money in Australia, no longer outside of it. At the beginning of this trouble we couldn't raise a sixpence. Since the position recovered and we have gone on the market time after time, we have had our loans subscribed within two hours on some occasions, almost subscribed before they are opened and always at a lower and a lower rate of interest and we raised our second last loan at the lowest rate of interest ever experienced in the history of Australia. So we see the recovery.

Gentlemen, may I say this, that one aspect of it, I think, is this: Away back in 1910, the Commonwealth Bank was established by a Labour Government. The Commonwealth Bank through the difficult time of the war period was Australia's financial salvation, operating as it did with private trading banks. That bank has gone on developing and throughout this difficult period, if you look back on Australia, you will see practically no failure of any bank that mattered, because of the close co-operation between the Central Commonwealth Bank which is a trading bank, too, and the trading banks. They carried the government on their shoulders, those banks, during the difficult times. They are now helping governments. Their systems, their methods have been absolutely sound, based as they were upon the old Scottish and English methods of long ago. We are proud, very proud of the Commonwealth Bank. It is set up by the people of Australia. It has an authority which controls our activities. And one thing and one of the reasons on which I differ with my old colleagues and the government which preceded it was that I laid it down and asked the Australian people to lay it down as they have—while I have the greatest admiration for politicians and I have associated with them for twenty-six years, it doesn't matter what party they belong to, I respect them and I believe some times the people of this country and any other country misjudge politicians and do not do them justice—with all due respect to their ability to handle national affairs, one of the duties of a politician is not to manage a National Commonwealth Bank—and I have laid it down as far as it is possible for me to lay it down, that neither the Parliament nor the government nor an individual politician shall lay any hand upon the management of that national institution that has been our safeguard through two of the most difficult periods in our history.

What the Commonwealth Bank has done is as the old man, now dead, at the head of it, Sir Robert Gibb, a hard-headed old Scotchman, said at the end. He said, "Lyons, when I look back on what it has done it seems to me like a fairy tale." And no bank in the world has ever done a greater job than the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, left entirely free to the men using it as an instrument for the betterment of the nation.

Therefore, that is the policy of the government with which I am associated, that the Board of Management shall be free from any interference. That Bank, in order to help our primary producers, reduced exchange 25 per cent. That acted as a subsidy to our primary producer the farmers, and it kept them in production and it was done because the Bank considered the economic factors, not because the politicians recommended it but because they looked into all these things as a national asset, free from party influences. Let us keep our hands off and let the men especially qualified to handle this thing go on with the management of it.

Now, there is just, perhaps, one other thing I would like to refer to because this morning I was speaking to your Prime Minister and your Ministers on this particular aspect and it is well, I think that we who have had some experience in any particular direction might give the benefit of our experience for others and they can decide for themselves what course they will follow. In the Australian Constitution which is more like the American, of course, than like the Canadian, there was set forth the provision in it for grants to States in difficulties by the Commonwealth—necessitous difficulties. There was no great financial cohesion between the States and the Commonwealth in the beginning but at the time when I was Premier of Tasmania and the Bruce Page Government was in office in the Commonwealth the Bruce Page Government brought forward a proposal for closer cooperation between the State and the Commonwealth. At that time each of us was going on, competing for whatever few shillings there happened to be in the market and offering any old price to get it. The most extravagant offered the highest price with the result that the money lender was living in a paradise and getting the highest rates of interest because seven governments were fighting, one with another to get whatever was available. Consequently, we created between the Commonwealth and the States a financial agreement and the people of Australia put the financial agreement into the Constitution. The chief points are that we sit around the table, State representatives and Commonwealth representatives and that we put forward our various loaning proposals, also our works proposals and what is available from London and we decide whether the market will stand the whole of it. If it does, each gets what he asks for. If the market will not provide the whole of it we have a method of allocation between us. That has worked very satisfactorily, largely because we decide the rate of interest. We are the chief borrower in the whole community and with the co-operation and advice of the Commonwealth Bank Board we decide what we shall pay for the money we borrow, and the States say themselves.

It has been suggested: Is there any disadvantage to the States in this? I see none, Ladies and Gentlemen. When this was brought into existence I signed the financial agreement as the representative of a State, a State that has generally been in financial difficulties, the smallest of all the States. And I have had to operate it as the representative of the Commonwealth and whether as a State representative or as the Commonwealth representative, I find it satisfactory. It doesn't matter what the political party is. When we formed that I think there were four Labour Governments that signed it. Today, we have a couple of Labour Governments in Australia and the question is never raised as to what government is making the request for assistance for its share in the loan monies. That doesn't make any difference whatever. We meet as States and Commonwealth. When there is any difficulty about allocating the money, the Commonwealth has two bites and the State has six bites, so you can see the State is not under any disadvantage. If there is any disadvantage it is to the Commonwealth. There is only one borrower and if a State fails in the payments of its interest, the Commonwealth under that and under the Constitution is compelled to meet that payment on behalf of the State, so you have not only the security of the backing of six States or the individual State in any particular case, but the whole of the Commonwealth behind that undertaking, too.

We have had the experience of one State, for political reasons, not for economic reasons but for political reasons, refusing to pay, the Commonwealth making that payment for the sake of the good name of Australia and then going out and collecting from the State, in turn with the backing of the people of that State.

(Applause.)

So that is working satisfactorily with us. For you, I don't know. That is a matter for Canada. She decides for herself. I only want to give you a little of the experience we have had and I am perfectly sure the co-operation in borrowing has saved the people of Australia huge sums of money in interest and as a matter of fact, it exercises a check, one upon the other.

All I want to say in conclusion, Gentlemen, is this, to thank you so sincerely for the welcome you have given us, for the encouragement you have given, to thank you for the recognition you give to whatever little effort we have made on behalf of our country and to express the hope that we shall both be out of our difficulties before long.

One thing we are very proud of in Australia is this: There has been no default whatever of the Commonwealth or any State or municipality. There is no default in any part of Australia (Applause.) And we hold our heads high through the world because of that and we have two reasons for that: the one, our own pride and self-respect, and the other, our pride as members of the Great British Empire and we have tried to live up to the traditions of that Empire and prove ourselves worthy of it, as you in Canada have. Therefore, in our travels throughout the world we don't carry any apologies whatever. We say we are members of the British Empire. We are proud of the Empire and its traditions, its achievements and its objectives today. We are proud, as an Australian people and as a part of them we make no apologies at all. We are proud people, proud of our record, short and all as it is in the world history; proud of the courage our people have shown, whether on the battle field or in the days of peace, in the difficult days we have recently passed through. We are trying today just to lay the foundations in such a way that the superstructure that will be built upon those foundations in the generations and the centuries to come will be of such a character that those who live in that great land of ours will be just as proud of the superstructure as we are proud of the foundation we are laying down for the building. (Applause prolonged.)

Mr. T. Frank Matthews: Right Honourable Mr. Lyons, Honourable Mr. Hepburn, Gentlemen: I am sure you have enjoyed this simple, explanatory talk by Mr. Lyons. He is certainly proud of being a native of Tasmania and proud of being a Premier of the Commonwealth of Australia. As a writer in an editorial in the newspaper said, "His characteristics are honesty, simplicity and the faculty of holding warring factions together."

He went into office in 1931 at a very difficult time and he has told you very frankly what has been done to overcome the difficulties and place the Commonwealth on a firm, solid foundation.

His slogan, in the last election, particularly, was: "Restore Confidence," and you can see from what he did how the people have trusted him. They have backed him up and confidence has been restored throughout the Commonwealth of Australia because of such a leader.

We assure the Right Honourable Mr. Lyons that we appreciate more than we can tell you your coming here to address this audience, made up of the Clubs you have heard mentioned by the Chairman and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Board of Trade and we do hope it will not be your last visit here. This is the Honourable Mr. Lyons' first visit to Canada, his first visit to Great Britain, and he has told you how he enjoyed the conferences in London and we sincerely trust his enjoyment will not be lessened in Canada. He is hurrying through and we are giving him rather a warm reception but I trust that you and Mrs. Lyons will complete your journey in Canada to your satisfaction and that you will enjoy good health and that during the long trip of 7,000 miles from Vancouver to Sydney you will recover the strength you have exhausted in meeting such people as we have here and in delivering this address. We assure you, we will welcome you back if you care to come.

I might add, Australia has something on us in the makeup of their Senate. The Senate of Australia is not appointed, it is elected. Two members from each State are elected for six years, after which they retire.

We are also proud of the record of our banks here during the difficult times through which we have been passing. We have now a Canadian Bank also which will function as Mr. Lyons has said the Commonwealth Bank functions in Australia. I do think that all the provinces of Canada and the Dominion itself can learn a great deal from what has happened in Australia under the government of Mr. Lyons.

THE SYMBOL OF ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION

AN ADDRESS BY RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR (FRANK) BOYD MERRIMAN

Tuesday, September 3rd, 1935.

The Right Honourable Sir (Frank) Boyd Merriman was the guest speaker at a special meeting of The Empire Club of Canada held on Tuesday, September 3, 1935, in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, Canada. The speaker was introduced by Mr. J. H. Brace, President of The Empire Club.

MR. J. H. BRACE: At our head table today we have a number of distinguished members of the Bench and the Bar who have come to do honour to our guest speaker today. We welcome them to our midst.

This is a special meeting and it is the first meeting at which I have presided. It has been called to take advantage of Sir Boyd Merriman's presence in this city.

Sir Boyd Merriman is President of the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division of the High Court of Justice in England.

My legal friends advise me that our system of appointment of Judges is possibly subject to some criticism. In Canada, Judges are appointed for no special work. They are presumed to know all of the law and to be able to act in any case. In England, Judges are specialists.

As you know, our honoured guest presides over three special branches of the Court. It has generally been accepted that in our life there are three milestones—birth, marriage and death. In recent years there has been a fourth dimension added to some extent, more in some countries than in others, and you will note that Sir Boyd Merriman is presiding over the Court having to do with two of these four major events—divorce and marriage. He also presides over the Court having to do with shipping. These three are rather strange bedfellows. I don't know just what the answer is to such a combination.

Sir Boyd is returning from a trip across Canada and possibly had some of us been making that trip, keeping in mind the recent election in the West, when we got back over the Rocky Mountains we might have destroyed the rest of our transportation and decided to live there where we could live in happiness and without worry for the future.

However, our speaker today is going back to a country which has shown definitely that it is going into better times and a country which has cleared up many of the difficulties which are still confronting us in Canada. Sir Boyd has had a broad experience in many lines of activity. He is, I know a very gifted speaker and we will appreciate hearing from him on any subject that he cares to talk to us about.

I have very much pleasure, Gentlemen, in introducing to you today, the Honourable Sir Boyd Merriman of England.

RT. HON. SIR BOYD MERRIMAN: Mr. President, My Lords, and Gentlemen: It did not need the reminder of a voyage in the steamship, "Empress of Britain," that glorious example of the enterprise of Canada, to remind one that Canada is faithful to the British tradition of the sea. And I don't think that you will regard it as wholly inappropriate if the latest in succession of those Judges who have for centuries exercised the Admiralty jurisdiction in England were to speak for a few moments today to a gathering of representatives of all sections of Canadian thought of the emblem of the Admiralty jurisdiction, the silver oar of the Admiralty which is placed on the Bench when the Judge takes his seat.

I need scarcely say I am not going to speak on this subject as if it were a purely legal matter, but to use this symbol of the Admiralty jurisdiction as the text for what

I am afraid will be an all too slight address on the history of that jurisdiction.

Now, the Admiralty, as you know, is a branch of the Royal prerogative. The very name, derived from the root 'amir' or 'emir,' is symbolic of that, and the silver oar is symbolic of the authority of the Lord High Admiral who, whether he exercises that office individually, or whether it is, as it now is and has been for a long time, in Commission, is the representative of the Crown in the Admiralty.

In 1840, or a hundred years ago, the High Court of the Admiralty was definitely established by Act of Parliament, and in 1875 the Admiralty Court became part of that group of jurisdictions to which your President has referred. But from the time of Edward, the Third, that is six centuries, there has undoubtedly been a Lieutenant Judge of the Lord High Admiralty whose duty it was to administer justice on behalf of the Lord High Admiral. So, Gentlemen, when the Admiralty Judge takes his seat, preceded by this silver oar, about which I am going to speak, just as the mace is the symbol of authority in a House of Parliament or a house of representatives, so this silver oar is the visible symbol of the authority to administer justice, not according to the laws civil, not according to the common law of England, but according to the ancient customs of the sea, as modified, of course, by statutes, international conferences, and so forth.

It may be of interest in passing to note that one of my friends of the Canadian Bar Association, the other day told me that quite recently he had had occasion to go to the Federal Court of Philadelphia and there in one of the courts he observed before the Judge a silver oar. Asking how that came to be there and what the significance of it was, he was informed that that was the Admiralty Judge and that this oar had been in use in that Court for many years before the American independence and had remained in use ever since. (Laughter.)

Now, I am going first to describe, as best I can, the oar itself and then to speak for a few moments about some of the features from which its history is to be deduced. Now, imagine what in effect is the old form of canoe paddle or steering oar with a blade elongated, diamond-shape, about a foot long and with a stem about two feet, three, divided into three sections by rings, with a fairly substantial butt to the shaft. The whole is of silver. Now, on the blade there are four emblems. I am going to describe them first and then come back to their significance afterwards.

At the point of the blade there is an arched crown embossed on the face of the blade. The central arch has been cut away and this was done by somebody at some unknown time to enable a more recent modern crown to be engraved on the blade itself within the arch of the old crown. Immediately below that and as it were across the widest part of the oar, are the arms of England, quartered with the arms of France, with the unmistakeable supporters of it, Henry the Seventh's arms. There is no question at all that those arms are Henry the Seventh's own group of arms.

Under that is a ducal coronet surrounded by the garter and that is the coronet of William the Fourth, when he was still Duke of Clarence. He was, in fact, as I will emphasize in a moment, the last individual to hold the office of Lord High Admiral. It merged again with the Crown when he acceded to the throne.

Again, below that and at just about the point where the blade joins the stock, is the Admiralty anchor which is actually the emblem of the Admiralty. This anchor is invariably reproduced with the cable twisted around the stock. For that reason, the irreverent seaman invariably talks of the Admiralty Court as being "held with the sign of the fouled anchor."

Coming to the shaft on the top section there is the silver assay mark of George the Third, which fixes the date of that particular piece of silver as being somewhere between 1784, when that particular mark was first embossed, and 1820, when, of course, George the Third, ceased to reign.

On the lower section there are three assay marks, one the leopard's head which is the assay mark of the Goldsmiths Company, the King's mark—the lion passant—and the third, a letter of a particular year, or signifying a particular maker, the record of which is lost; and finally, engraved on the butt of the stock there are the words, "Jasper Swift, Marshal of the Admiralty."

Now, this oar, as I have told you, is carried into Court when the Judge sits, by the Admiralty Marshal, and is the emblem of his authority to arrest any ship against whom it is alleged that there is some claim.

Now, there are the actual marks upon the oar itself. A curious thing is that there is, so far as is known, no written record whatever of the history of this oar and, therefore, its history and the history of the Admiralty jurisdiction has to be deduced from these things which I have described upon the face of the oar itself and I will just go through what is to be inferred from these marks and I will take them chronologically, but going backwards.

Now, the latest mark is the mark of William the Fourth, the ducal coronet and garter of William the Fourth, while he was still Duke of Clarence and the last individual Lord High Admiral. Incidentally, he is the only royal duke who has been Lord High Admiral.

As you know, nowadays the office is in Commission and what we call the Lords of the Admiralty, the people who rule the navy, are themselves known as the Lords Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral.

Now, next is the arched crown at the point of the blade. It was a shocking act of vandalism—whoever perpetrated it—to cut out the centre arch of this crown, but I dare say it wouldn't be too rash a guess if one supposed that that was done when William the Fourth became king, in order that his royal arms might be engraved upon the blade.

Then, there is the assay mark of George the Third. It is quite impossible, of course, to suppose that that represents the date of the oar itself. There is much too much that is earlier upon the oar to suppose that, but that section in which the assay mark occurs is the section which would rest upon the shoulder of the Admiralty Marshal as he carries the oar. The probability is that this had worn away in the process of time and that the silver had to be repaired, with the result that the reigning monarch's assay mark was put upon it. And that that is not a fanciful suggestion is shown by the fact that in the Duchy of Cornwall there is an oar representing the Admiralty jurisdiction of Devon and Cornwall, and which is preserved, and that particular section of the oar is in fact worn away from use.

But, in other words, so far from George the Third's assay mark being evidence of modernity, it is really evidence of the antiquity of the oar.

Then, the next in order of date is the name of Jasper Swift, whose name and title as Admiralty Marshal is engraved on the butt of the oar. There is no date but there is in existence, dated 1586, in the twenty-eighth year of Queen Elizabeth, a precept addressed by Lord Howard of Effingham who was Elizabeth's Lord High Admiral, to Jasper Swift, Marshal, to arrest certain pilots and villians who had been guilty of their depredations in the Thames. So we have got that particular date fiixed as being in Queen Elizabeth's time.

And, as I have already said, we have on the blade the arms of Henry the Seventh, the reign in which Cabot discovered Cape Breton. The arms of England and France are shown quartered because, of course, that was before the time when Queen Mary said that on her death they would find the lost Calais engraved upon her heart. And the curious thing about this particular coat of arms is that it is not part of the original blade. It has been superimposed on the blade, probably in substitution for some earlier coat of arms and it is merely a speculation but the theory has been put forward that when Henry the Seventh, as the result of his success in knocking out King Richard the Third at the Battle of Bosworth Field, founded a new dynasty, the Lord High Admiral whom he appointed may very well have removed the arms of Richard, Duke of Gloucester, his predecessor, immediately but one, who had been the brother of Edward the Fourth, as a compliment, removing the obnoxious Yorkist arms as a compliment to the founder of the new dynasty.

Then, finally, there is the most puzzling thing of all, the assay mark on the lowest ring. Apparently this particular combination of three assay marks, the goldsmith's mark, the king's mark and this unknown letter is entirely unknown at Goldsmith's, but it would satisfy the requirements of the thirty-seventh year of Edward, that is 1363, which was the year in which the king's mark was first instituted and it was in the reign of Edward the Third, that the first definite writ was issued to a judge, to a Lieutenant Judge, to hold a Court on behalf of the Lord High Admiral, and it may very well be that that particular piece of silver on the oar, even if the rest is more modern, may date back to the very foundations of the admiralty in the time of Edward the Third.

So, the fouled anchor which is engraved on the blade has been a silent witness of the administration of admiralty justice, whether good, bad or indifferent, at any rate since Tudor times, and possibly since the very foundation of the jurisdiction in the time of Edward the Third.

Now, Gentlemen, that is the history, so far as it can be deduced from the oar itself, and I said that there was no written record or history of the oar, but there is rather an interesting record which is graven in stone. In the time of Queen Elizabeth, in the first twenty-five years of her reign, one, Dr. David Lewis was the Judge in Admiralty. He died in 1584. He was, as it happens, the son of the Vicar of the old Priory Church of Abergavenny. Incidentally, he was the first President of the then newly founded Jesus College of Oxford, and as I have already said, he was also Jugde of the Admiralty Court. Rather a curious mixture which, however, was by no means unknown in those days. Now, he, dying in 1584, had designed his own tomb. Now, however much one might distrust a record of Dr. David Lewis himself, composed by himself, I think when I tell you about the tomb you will agree there is no reason to doubt the truth of what he put on it because he put nothing about himself, but he did put a great deal about his coat. Here lies incumbent on the tomb in his full robes, the old Admiralty Judge with his head resting on a couple of books which may or may not be intended to represent some of the ancient books of the Admiralty; but on the front of the tomb itself there are three arches. The arch under his head is the skull, the emblem of immortality. In a frame are three books, one probably the old code of sea laws, the laws of Oléron which came down from the time of the Fourth Crusade, from Richard the First and are still preserved in the record office; the old black book of the Admiralty which is the earliest known digest of the laws of the sea which is also preserved in the record office, and another book which I have got in my library at the Law Court, a book a precepts of the Admiralty Jurisdiction. I think there is probably no doubt that the old gentleman intended to depict these three books surrounding the emblem of immortality.

Then, on the middle panel there is our friend, the fouled anchor again, exactly as represented on the walls of the court and on the Admiralty wall. And in the last panel there is the figure of a man in the robes of the Marshal or Sergeant of Admiralty, carrying over his shoulder an unmistakable representation of the Admiralty oar The last section of the stock is missing but it is plainly discernible that it was there; and on the blade, though of course there are not all the things that are on it now, there is unquestionably the arched crown, the arms of Henry the Seventh, and the fouled anchor.

In other words, the old Judge determined to immortalize himself in his robes of office and preceded into Eternity by the Admiralty Marshal carrying the Admiralty oar. Now, he died in 1584, and as I told you, we have a precept directed to Jasper Swift, dated 1586, so I think it doesn't require any effort of the imagination, or one cannot be accused of exercising imagination in supposing that figure thus depicted, carrying the admiralty oar, on the panel on the tomb is none other than our friend, Jasper Swift whose name is engraved on the oar that goes into court every day with the Judge.

Now, Gentlemen, I hope I haven't been too tedious or too technical, but there is the history of this old symbol of an old jurisdiction. After all, I suppose every one in this room is proud of the fact that in matters maritime, in precautions for safety at sea, it is acknowledged that Great Britain has led the world and this oar which I have described is the emblem of the Court whose business it is to see that the high standard which sailors of the British Empire set and have always set all over the world in maritime safety, is observed and preserved.

(Applause.)

President Brace: Gentlemen, I am going to ask the Honourable Colonel G. R. Geary, Minister of Justice, to express to Sir Boyd Merriman, our appreciation for this most interesting address today.

The Honourable Colonel G. R. Geary: Mr. President, Sir Boyd, My Lords, and Gentlemen: From this point one can determine from the expression of the faces of those who are lunching that Sir Boyd's subject has been happily chosen and has evoked the greatest possible interest in you. He, himself, is of the present generation of a long line of judges who established the reign of law in the Old Land. Probably of all our inheritance from the Old Land there is none more dear to us than the system of maintenance of law and order and the administration of justice. We cling to that in this country as one of our dearest possessions and it is befitting, that Sir Boyd has introduced us to some extent to the antiquity of the administration of justice, its long continued evolution, even from the time when kings sought to impose their will upon the courts, to this time when the lowest of all his subjects may come to him and be sure that he will be given justice.

We are glad too, to see and know from what Sir Boyd has said, from our personal contact with him, that the Judiciary in England is still composed of those who will maintain that great tradition.

I am sure I speak for you when I propose to the Chairman that he put a motion, thanking Sir Boyd very much indeed for this happy and interesting address.

PRESIDENT BRACE: It is not our custom to have a formal motion but I know from the expression you have just given that you have enjoyed very much hearing Sir Boyd. (Applause.)

EDUCATION AND THE FUTURE OF CIVILIZATION

AN ADDRESS BY
MR. E. SALTER DAVIES, C.B.E., M.A.

Thursday, October 3rd, 1935.

PRESIDENT J. H. BRACE: Today we have with us a number of gentlemen from the Old Land. They are Directors of Education, representing England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. They have been for the past month travelling across Canada from coast to coast as guests of the National Council of Education.

This year is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Overseas Educational League. This organization has done much to foster the interchange of educational thought within the British Empire. During the past twenty-five years, 7,000 Canadian teachers and students have visited the Old Land, either by means of exchange of teaching positions with teachers from that land or for purposes of special study. The Overseas Educational League has done much to assist in these transfers and to look after these Canadians when they were overseas. We welcome today most heartily these visitors who are with us. (Applause.) We trust they have enjoyed their visit in Canada. We hope they will return to their own land with memories of a people who are strong in adversity, a people who are ever conscious of their responsibility, a people who will, as they have in the past, adhere strongly to the British Empire and a people who are and always have been loyal to the British throne. (Applause.)

Representing this group today, we will have an address from Mr. E. Salter Davies. Mr. Davies is Director of Education for Kent. He is President of the British Library Association. He is life trustee of the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust and he is a member of many societies interested in education, in prison reform and in social progress. Mr. Davies has written extensively on a number of these subjects. Today he is going to address us on the subject "Education and the Future of Civilization." Mr. Davies.

MR. E. SALTER DAVIES: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: First of all I should like to thank you, Sir, on behalf of my colleagues and myself for your very kindly welcome. We are very grateful to the National Council of Education and the Overseas League for making this pilgrimage of ours a possibility and we thank you, Sir, and The Empire Club of Canada for your kindly welcome and hospitality today. I can assure you we shall go back to our country, not quite as we came. Canada and the people of Canada will mean something more to us than they have meant in the past. Our experience has been widened, our minds have been enriched and our hearts have been warmed by your kindness and your hospitality.

The subject which has been selected for me is a somewhat formidable one but is, perhaps as you will think, not inappropriate to the present moment.

I see from the Canadian papers that a distinguished American professor has lately been expressing dissatisfaction with the results of education. Well, dissatisfaction is a healthy symptom. Content means stagnation. In a healthy discontent lies our only hope for future progress. At the same time, discontent has its dangers—dangers, I think, that are apt, particularly, to affect men and women of my own age. We tend to be "praisers of the past" and to think that nothing today is quite as it was when we were young. The best answer to that sort of feeling which, I think, is always a sign of senility—the best answer to that feeling is that which was made by our English humorous publication, *Punch*. To the accusation that it was not now as funny as it used to be, it replied, "It never was."

We can take comfort to ourselves, perhaps, by remembering that that complaint has been uttered by all men and all women throughout the ages, I was reading the other day, a letter by Queen Mary, of England, at the time repairs were proceeding at the Royal Palace at Greenwich and Queen Mary bitterly complained that the British workman was not what he used to be.

Even earlier, in the diary of an Egyptian princess of over 3,000 years ago, that princess complains that the young people of her generation were not as virtuous, were not as well behaved as the children of the former generation.

The complaint, however, deserves serious consideration and perhaps Dr. Butler intends us to mediate upon our practice of education, our methods, our curriculum, and to ask ourselves the searching question, whether we are really trying to apply in practice those principles which in theory we profess.

You remember that Mr. G. K. Chesterton replied to the accusation that Christianity had failed, "No, Christianity has never been tried."

Now, when we are talking about any subject it is just as well that we should get our definitions clear. There is a story told of the English humorist, Sidney Smith. He saw two women quarrelling with their heads out of windows on opposite sides of the street. He remarked "Those two women will never agree, they are arguing from different premises."

Now, in one sense, all life is educative. Education does not end when schooling ends. School is the preparation for the wider education of life. It is the English poet, Meredith, who says, "We spend our lives in learning pilotage, and grow good steermen when the vessel's crank."

But when we are gathered in a meeting like this, we are considering education in its smaller aspect as schooling. Now, all human life is a struggle of an individual to realize himself as a conscious part of the world to which he belongs. It is, therefore, to some extent the adaptation of the individual to his environment but it is more than that. The human being has the power, to a limited extent, to alter his environment in order to bring it into conformity with his own activity. Therefore, education is the deliberate, human effort which is directed upon the individual with the two-fold object of enabling him to be at home in his environment, to understand the world in which he is placed, and at the same time to enable him to do something to bring his environment into harmony with his own conscious purposes.

I think nothing is more remarkable in education than the loftiness of the definitions of education that have been given by great men throughout the ages and the extraordinary agreement from century to century in those definitions. The heathen philosopher, writing four hundred years before the birth of Christ, defined the aim of education as the attempt to produce "likeness to God, so far as that is possible to man." I see that Sir Auckland Geddes speaking some few years ago to an Education Association in the States, defined education in somewhat similar terms as "the process designed to help a being to appreciate God, to know himself, to understand the spirit of the age in which he is placed so that he can live, serve and act with and on the community of which he forms a part." Professor Whitehead defines education as the process which is designed to bring about "a balanced growth of individuality." And, I think that on any prize-giving platform in England, there is one sentence which can always be relied upon to bring a cheer and that is that the aim of education is the training of character.

The aim of education is the training of character, but there is a school of thought which is in violent opposition to any such theory. I remember that when the English Education Act was passed in 1918, a landmark for all time in the history of English education, providing for the establishment of central schools for the older and more advanced children and for day continuation schools (which, Alas, have never yet been realized,) when that Act was passed an article appeared in, shall I say, a notorious English journal, controlled by a noble lord. This article complained that "at vast expense new schools were to be erected by which millions of fruitful workers were to be withdrawn from industry and kept at school where they would be given a meagre information on subjects totally removed from their daily task. The cowboys would learn, not about land, but about the wives of Henry the Eighth. The dairymaids would become experts, not in agriculture, but astronomy," and so on and so on.

That sort of attack is typical of a certain school of journalism which is well known in my own country and which, I am sure, is entirely absent from this fortunate Dominion. Its object is not to tell the truth but to do as much mischief as possible to the particular cause which it is attacking.

Now, just consider that sort of criticism of education which, though exaggerated in tone is after all typical of a good many criticisms which are made in all countries about education, some of which I have heard from luncheon and dinner tables, even in my brief stay in Canada. The suggestion is that the plough-boy should receive an education which would fit him to be all his life a plough-boy and that any deviation into history or astronomy or so forth, is out of place. It is perfectly obvious—isn't it?—that that sort of criticism is based on a fallacy and the fallacy is " once a plough-boy, always a plough-boy." There have been plough-boys who have written their name large on the pages of history. It was a plough-boy who sang in immortal verse:

"The rank is but the guinea stamp,
The man's the gowd for a' that."

As for the dairy-maid, and astronomy, if the dairy-maid looks up from her milk pail into the Heavens she will see there the Milky Way, and the ploughboy will see what in England we call "The Great Plough." The constellations of the Heavens are named after such vulgar things as ploughs and milk-pails.

Moreover, even if a plough-boy remains a plough-boy, the art of ploughing and the kindred arts do not exhaust the whole of his time. We have been told for years past that the age of machinery was bound to create greater leisure for all. I am doubtful myself about the realization of that prophecy. It ought to be true. By all logic it ought to be true but the stupidity of man is such as I think will prevent its realization for a very, very long time. Nevertheless, it is foolish to suggest that schooling should confine its attention to vocation and should have no regard to the leisure activities which boys and girls will engage in after they leave school. We who are professed educationists hold that, after all, underlying all vocations there is a common element of humanity which must be catered for and we believe that it is essential that, before a specific education for industry is entered upon, there must be a sound general education; and I think the greatest danger which affects education at this moment is perhaps the tendency to antedate this period of specific, technical, educational instruction and to shorten the period of general liberal education.

May I, while I am on this topic, say one word more, that the educationists will never agree that material success, estimated in terms of money, can ever determine the success or otherwise of any individual. There are poor men who have made a success of their lives. There are men who have a large bank roll of whom it may be said, to what advantage is all that wealth to them, seeing that they have lost themselves.

I read in that delightful "Life of Sir Walter Scott" written by the Governor-General of Canada, whom we know and will know still, I think, as John Buchan, that the only failures in life, the only real failures in life are "the egotists, wrapped up in self, the doctrinaires in chains to a dogma, the Pharisees who despise their brethren." That is a noble sentiment.

Now, to consider for a moment the practical application of what I have been saying. First of all, education is concerned not with one or other aspect of the individual but with the whole man—body and mind, including the intellect, the imagination, the emotions and the will. First of all, I think we should all probably agree that there are four main aspects under which we may consider this subject of education. First of all there is the physical aspect. It is perfectly obvious that at the root of all our education must lie this physical education, the education of the body. I don't mean mere physical exercises, even coupled with games, but a real scientific study of the laws of health and their application to the human body so that the body may become the ready servant of the mind instead of, as so often it is, its master.

Secondly, there are certain elementary pieces of knowledge and skill which it is the object of the school to impart to the scholars. Reading and writing, the power to express oneself clearly, logically and even agreeably in speech and in writing. It is not a common art. I refrain for obvious reasons from dilating on that subject. It might lead to personal criticism. But the instruction in reading and writing, the mere giving of the tools of knowledge, the instruments of knowledge, is obviously not enough. What is the use of teaching boys and girls to read unless we see to it that there is available in the schools and elsewhere a reasonable supply of books which will interest them? In every school there should be a school library, not a repository of dead volumes, but a library replenished from time to time to keep pace with the changing years.

We must give our pupils some understanding of number, the order and harmony of the universe and the power to deal with the simple reckonings of daily life. That is important, very important, fundamental. Yet, I cannot help thinking that we have loaded this subject of arithmetic with all sorts of mysterious, almost inexplicable calculations which are of no earthly practical use and are clung to simply from a pathetic belief that somehow or another, delving into these mysteries is a good preparation for a business life. I believe that is an entire fallacy.

Those who have read that very delightful, humorous book, by F. Anstey, called "Vice Versa"—if you have not read it, let me cordially advise you to read it at the earliest possible moment—will remember the merchant who is transformed into his scapegrace son and has to go to school. It is really, Gentlemen, a tragic story, Mr. Bultitude, the aforesaid city merchant is appalled when he sits down to the school-desk at the glaring improbability of the problems which he is called upon to solve.

And, not to dilate on this topic, there are history and geography. Everybody will agree all children should be given some knowledge of the history and the growth of society, of the growth of social and political institutions in a very simple way; and in geography, there should be some description of the natural phenomena which affect man's life on this planet so very greatly, and of the distribution of peoples; in addition, some knowledge should be given of the simple laws of science, not only of the physical constituents of the world, but also of the science of life.

It is curious how excessive devotion to physics and chemistry seems almost inevitably to lead to a material view of the universe which, I believe, can be corrected only by the science of life. That is why I think simple biology is coming into the curriculum of the schools.

But what is the good of teaching all this to our children unless we also teach them how to use the knowledge, the instruments we have put into their hands.

I came across the other day an unpublished letter—unpublished so far as I know because I saw the original, written by John Ruskin in 1868 from his house in Denmark Hill—and that letter begins like this:

"Sir, the real impediment to all education is the idea that teaching men to read and write educates them. It no more educates them than giving them a revolver makes them a soldier." He goes on to describe two rascals of his acquaintance and one he describes as 'an impudent imposter' and the other as 'a lascivious thief.' "Both men," he said, "could read and write. Both in a sense have been educated but they had never learned to use the knowledge at their disposal."

And he concludes the letter: "Sir, the first law of all education is to teach our youth to love truth and speak it, to love work and thoroughly do it, to love knowledge and seek it, not in hovels but in fields and seas and only so far as we love these three things ourselves can we teach the love of them to others."

Thirdly, if you have still followed my analysis, we must train our pupils in love of beauty, train their taste, and I believe that we have unduly neglected the aesthetic side of education. You have only to look around you—I had better put it, we in England have only to look around us—to see how the beauty of nature has been defaced by ugly greed, by those who haven't the sense to see that beauty hasn't only a value in itself but also a commercial value. I am told there is a pamphlet now going around in some parts of the States, warning people not to visit my own beautiful County of Kent, so far has it been defaced by hideous advertisements and by unlovely, unchecked buildings. I hope tourists will nevertheless visit the County of Kent. It is still, in spite of defacement, one of the most beautiful parts of England. It gives serious thought to think that such a pamphlet could have been written at all.

Finally, fourth, we must teach our children, as far as we can, to live in society together and part of the work of schools is to teach communal living. I believe we have been reasonably successful so far as our nation, so far as our own British Empire goes. Internationally, we have hardly been so successful and the doctrine of national selfishness, which on the Continent of Europe, at least, and elsewhere, has been elevated into a gospel, threatens the security and happiness of the world today.

In England, in 1929, we had a Committee of business men which sat to report upon education generally and particularly in regard to the relation of education and industry. Their report, very briefly, can be summarized as follows: They warmly welcomed the proposals in the Education Act to which I have already referred and which were treated in such scathing terms by Lord Rothermere's journal. These business men heartily welcomed that expansion and development of education. They had examined carefully the charge often made, possibly made even in Canada, that with the development of education the three R's, those sacred three R's, are not so thoroughly taught as they used to be. They said that, according to the evidence they received, that charge was not substantiated. They pleaded for a wider teaching of handicrafts of all description for boys and girls on the ground, surely obvious to all, that there are a number of boys and girls of the highest intelligence who are appealed to mainly through the hands and not through the printed word. They pronounced the verdict that with regard to general intelligence and adaptability, they had no complaint of our educational system and they said that what they wanted was not vocational instruction but instruction which would train the boys and girls in the school in general intelligence and in adaptability. They pleaded for a more generous equipment for games, because while we in England have always believed that games were of the utmost advantage, in the past we have seen to it that they were supplied in those schools which on the whole were attended by the children of the more wealthy parents. In the public schools as we call them, Eton and Harrow and the rest, there was always provision for games, but the children of the poor who went to the elementary schools, in the past had little or no such provision. I am glad to say all that is now being corrected. No education authorities would dare to build a secondary school or an elementary school without seeing to it that there was adequate playing space. And, finally, the Committee complained that the classes were still too large and that teachers could not do their work properly while such conditions existed.

Now, I believe what we want most of all in education is a living faith in its power to mould the character and the habits of our people. There is a stimulating Latin quotation, "Possunt, quia posse videntur" which means, "They can because they think they can." How many failures are there which are due to want of faith!

I believe that some of us who believe with all our hearts in social progress are still misled by false analogy. We think that social progress somehow or other, proceeds at something like the same pace as natural evolution. It may have taken millions of years to effect a change in animal structure but we have seen in our own time the habits and the character of a nation revolutionized within a generation. I believe that given the faith and the will which is the outcome of a living faith, we could, within a generation, bring about a transformation which would amaze the world.

May I read you the words of His Majesty, the King, which were in reply to a message from the London County Council on the conclusion of peace in 1919:

"I am convinced," said His Majesty, "that nothing is more essential to national prosperity and happiness than education. The potentialities, physical, mental and spiritual, of every member of the community should be developed to the greatest possible extent. A true education will embrace all these, will cultivate them all in due proportion and would transform our national life within a generation. I appeal to you and through you to all education authorities to keep this great ideal in mind."

There are countries in Europe today in which the whole forces of education from the primary school to the university are being concentrated toward the realization of a national ideal. That ideal is not ours. We believe in a state built up by the willing service of free individuals,

"Britain, the land that freemen till,
That sober-suited Freedom chose,
The land, where girt with friends or foes,
A man may speak the thing he will."

We believe in freedom and our loyalties are not to be constrained by the gangster's club or the muderer's bullet. We are bound to one another by ties of affection and of loyalty to principles which we will not abandon at the behest of any demagogue. We pride ourselves on our national virtues of toleration, good humour, common sense, allied with courage, determination and self control but today, surely these are not enough.

In the countries which I have in mind there is a deliberate and a successful attempt to enlist the whole forces of the nation in the service of a particular national ideal. We have our own national ideal. Our British Commonwealth of Nations under our most Christian King and Governor has set an example to the world of what the world might be, a brotherhood of nations, each with its own peculiar characteristics, each making its own contribution to the common weal.

What might we British not do if we could bring to the service of our national ideal the same devotion and the same singleness of purpose which the Russian and the German and the Italian brings to his conception of the state and of society? If we could combine with what they boast of as their "unflinching rationality," a full devotion, in thought and in act, to those spiritual ideals which alone give meaning and dignity to man's life upon this earth? (Applause, prolonged.)

President Brace: I am going to ask Principal Wallace to express the thanks of this audience to Mr. Davies.

Principal Wallace: Mr. President, our Guests and Gentlemen: It is a great pleasure to be allowed to voice our thanks to our guests and particularly to Mr. Davies. It seems to me that one of the great advantages, one of the greatest advantages that we have from our British connection is just illustrated in the talk that we have listened to today, namely that our ideals are changed or modified or criticized continually by the ideals of the older land from which most of us have sprung. It seems to me that it is a very great privilege indeed for the members of this Club to listen to an address so full of interest, so full of wisdom as the address to which we have just listened. My own feeling was, and I am sure it was shared by many of you, that it would be a particularly pleasant experience if there were two or three hours following this lecture, assigned to the particular business of bandying ideas back and forth with Mr. Davies. I am inclined to think one of the tests of a good lecture is, Does it make you wish to pursue the subject further? Does it tend to make you wish to offer modifications here, and modifications there, pronounce agreements here and disagreements there? I can only say, Gentlemen, that the address today seemed to me singularly wise and sane. It possessed a wisdom and a sanity, unfortunately of which our world today is in sad need. Education, I suppose is the most hackneyed of all topics, the topic which requires some courage in any man if he wishes to make it the subject of his address and yet a subject which is so intimately related to the most immediate practical concerns of this tormented world today, and as we listened to Mr. Davies we could not help feeling that the possibilities of regeneration for men are along this line, if along any.

But I do not wish to take up your time. I merely wish on your behalf to express to Mr. Davies our very great obligation to him for the honour he has done us in addressing us today and to wish for him and his colleagues from the British Isles a happy journey through Canada and a happy sojourn in our midst. (Applause.)

ETHIOPIA AND ITS PROBLEMS

An Address by
REV. DR. S. A. B. MERCER, B.A., Ph.D., D.D.

Thursday, October 10*th,* 1935

President Brace: We have been learning something during the past few weeks with respect to a so-called Ethiopian gentleman by the name of Joe Louis, a pugilist residing in Detroit. Likewise, the majorty of us have had more than a speaking acquaintance with other gentlemen who at times are referred to as Ethiopians who follow the practice of brushing our shoes at night, brushing our coat with one hand in the morning, with the other hand held out in a rather peculiar manner, but the average citizen has had very little knowledge of the true Ethiopian or of the Ethiopian country. It hasn't been a subject of much concern to us Canadians until the last few months and what little we know of that country and of those people we have read in the press, particularly during the last few weeks. In that country today, events are proceeding which may lead to very serious situations throughout the Western civilized world. Conditions are being carried out, things are being done which we, as Anglo-Saxons feel should not be done. It would seem as though Italy has been going ahead doing those things today that were done by Germany when Germany passed through Belgium in 1914. Naturally, the sympathy of the Anglo-Saxon is with the under dog. We are all anxious for more enlightenment; we all want to know more about this country and about its peoples.

Toronto is indeed fortunate in having as one of its permanent residents, Dr. Mercer, Professor of Egyptology in Trinity College. Dr. Mercer is a world known student of Ethiopia and its people. He is an outstanding scholar and an authority on these matters. I was talking to him a few moments ago with respect to his education. I referred to the fact that he received degrees from Harvard, Wisconsin, Munich and Nashota, and he gave the names of some other colleges that I just didn't grasp, but his whole life has been associated with college work and his life endeavour has been particularly associated with those things which are in the foreign interests of Africa, the country, the things that are found there and its people.

Dr. Mercer has been decorated by France, by Belgium and by Ethiopia. His decoration, received from the King of Kings, entitles him to sit in the Councils of the Ethiopian Government.

I have much pleasure, indeed, in calling on Dr. Mercer.

DR. MERCER: Mr. President, Gentlemen: Being neither a diplomat nor an expert in modern history, I want to warn you against taking any deductions or assumptions that I may make today in this address to you too seriously. But, being an Orientalist and knowing somewhat about Ethiopia, ancient and modern, I want to present to you today certain facts and in presenting them, I want to be as objective and as impartial as I possibly can be.

Under these circumstances, I am going to do as Caesar did about Gaul; I am going to divide my subject into three parts: The first part will have to do with Ethiopia, her people, her history and civilization. The second part will have to do with Italy's relations with Ethiopia; and the third part with the present problem, if I may use problem, instead of problems, as in the announcement of the title.

There are certain misunderstandings in people's minds about Ethiopia. I shall want to clear up some of these as I go along and to begin with, I want to take the first and most fundamental, though not very important, misunderstanding about Ethiopia, that is, her name. We English-speaking people speak of that country as Abyssinia. All English-speaking people speak of Abyssinia. So do the Germans, so do some other nations on the European Continent. The official name is Ethiopia, the name always used by France, Italy and other European nations. The original name of the country was Cush. That is found in the Egyptian inscriptions and in the Old Testament. When the Old Testament was translated into Greek, the Greeks used the word (Aithiopia.) The term, Abyssinia, did not come into use until the Middle Ages when Ethiopia was harassed by the Mahommedans and the Mahommedans looking down upon them, called the mixed people the Habesh or Habeshim. Hence, the English name, Abyssinia. But the official name is Ethiopia. I may use the name Abyssinia, I am so accustomed to it, although the official name is Ethiopia.

Ethiopia is in the eastern part of Africa, about 150 miles north of the Equator, a country covering about 350,000 square miles. Ethiopia is about as large as France and Germany put together. It is surrounded on all sides by foreign territory. On the north by Eritrea; on the east by French Somaliland and by British Somaliland; on the south by Italian Somaliland, and by Kenya Colony; and on the west and northwest by the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

One might divide the country into three kinds of strata. In the north, mountainous country, in the south mostly desert country, and in the centre, a great strip of volcanic country that stretches from one side of the country to the other and ranges about forty-five miles wide from north to south.

The population of Ethiopia has never been estimated scientifically. We think of the population as somewhere between about 10 and 15 millions, of which about 80 per cent are Christian, the bulk of the population and the ruling class being not negroid—that is another misconception—but being Semetic, coming originally from South Arabia. The language is a South Arabian language, the script is South Arabian script, and the culture is a South

Arabian culture. But beside the ruling class and the body of the people there are millions of African tribes belonging to Ethiopia, such as the Gallas, Gouraghi, Dankali, Somali, etc.

The Ethiopian is one of the most ancient civilizations in the world. It is the oldest Empire extant today. It has a civilization going back to as early as 1,000 B.C. if not earlier. According to later traditions, the Queen of Sheba, who married Solomon, had a son by him called Menelik. Menelik was the first king of Ethiopia, but that tradition doesn't tell us how the South Arabians got across the Red Sea into Africa. But they got across there and we know that by 700 B.C. they were already there, which was about 300 years after, and which indicates that they might have been in Africa before 1,000 B.C. By 700 B.C. they were powerful enough and strong enough with sufficient energy to conquer the mighty Empire of Egypt and there in Egypt to set up a special dynasty of their own, a dynasty which lasted over fifty years.

After the fall of Jerusalem when the Hebrews or the Jews were scattered into different parts of the world, some of these Jews, for they were called Jews then, made their way up into Egypt. Some settled on the Isle of Elephantine. Others went further south into Africa and settled in the country we now know as Ethiopia and for many years were very important and very numerous. Until about the seventh century, A,D. very little was known of them. They dwindled in numbers until about eigthy years ago a German scholar travelling in Ethiopia discovered the black Jews, the Jews in the north-west part of Abyssinia, and they thought they were the only Jews left in the world. They didn't know about the Jews in New York and in Toronto.

Abyssinia, in the third century, had become Christian and it seemed to have taken to it very rapidly because before very long the bulk of the population was Christian.

At the present time, about eighty per cent of the population is Christian.

Their greatest trial came in the Middle Ages in conflict with the other Christians who looked upon the Ethiopians as heretics because of their emphasis on the divine nature of our Lord, and because of the fact that they were shut in from the rest of the world about the end of the eleventh century, A.D. Up to then they marched shoulder to shoulder with European civilization At that time, being cut off from the rest of the world, their civilization stopped in its development, so that the civilization we meet with in Ethiopia is not a negroid civilization. It is similar to European civilizaton of about the eleventh century A.D., the form of government being Feudalism.

Very little was heard about Ethiopia with the exception of the Portuguese missions, until Europeans began to search for the source of the Nile and among the most important of these was an Englishman by the name of James Bruce who in the beginning of the seventeenth century went to Africa to search for the source of the Nile. He made his way up the Nile to Lake Tsana and there came in touch with Ethiopian civilization; but the event which really opened up Ethiopia to Egypt was the Battle of Magdala, the result of a dispute between England and Ethiopia in 1868, in which the Ethiopians were defeated and the English brought home to the British museum thousands of manuscripts which is important to me and which I always connect with the Battle of Magdala as being the most important aspect of that event.

At any rate, in other respects, the most important event in connection with that battle was that it opened up Ethiopia to Europe. From 1868 until the present day events went pretty rapidly in Ethiopia, the most important ruler during that period being the great Menelik, the Second, who succeeded in unifying his people and in creating a real empire.

I want to correct another misconception in connection with the history of Ethiopia and that has to do with the present ruler. I read in places and people ask me about the present Emperor of Abyssinia insinuating that he is a usurper. When Menelik died he had two daughters. Before his death, knowing that he had but two daughters and no sons, he advised that his successor should be his grandson, the son of one of his daughters. In 1903, Lej Yasu, Menelik's grandson came to the throne and for three years led such a life of debauchery, left the religion of his fathers and the majority of his peaple, joined the Mahommedan religion, demonstrated such a character of uselessness in his country, that the nation demanded his deposition and in 1916 he was deposed.

Now when Lej Yasu was deposed, it was decided that one of the daughters of the old Menelik reign, and that Ras Tafari Makonnen, Governor of Harrer, should be made Regent and heir apparent.

Now, he came legitimately to his position. He was Regent in 1916. He continued to bring Ethiopia before the world and to carry out reforms and by 1928 he had been so successful in his own country that the people of Ethiopia demanded that he be crowned king. So, in 1928 he was crowned king while the daughter of Menelik, Zauditu, was still sitting on the throne as Empress. In 1930 she died and Ras Tafari Makonnen became Haile Selassie, the First, founding a new dynasty but at the same time the great nephew of Menelik, the Second. There is nothing in the nature of usurpership in connection with Haile Selassie, the First. He is the legitimate Emperor of Ethiopia.

There is no need of telling you anything about Italy. The history of Italy and its contribution to civilization are too well known. Italy, the heir of the great Roman Empire, the last of the empires of the ancient world is know to all men as the home of art and science and music and literature and everything that is fine. And she kept her place among the nations of the world pretty well until about a hundred years before the Great War, when on account of conditions not controllable by herself she was relegated to, I suppose, a second rate power. Then came the Great War and Italy's magnificent contribution to that struggle and the way she manfully in 1915 took her part.

Then came years of confusion, especially political confusion, after the war. Two great parties were arising in Italy, the Communists and the Facists fighting one against the other until finally in 1922, the march on Rome and the establishment of the leader of the Facists, Mussolini in Rome as the dictator of that country.

Now, if there is one argument for dictatorship which is almost unanswerable, it is what Mussolini has done for Italy. We all remember (who went to Italy before the Great War) and know what Italy was. Italy was a land of art, a land of music, a land of dirt, and of beggars, and in a few years after Mussolini came into power there were no more beggars and dirt in Italy. Anyone who has travelled in Italy in the last few years can see what a wonderful transformation he has made in that wonderful country, how efficient, how up to date, how clean, how magnificent is that country of the Caesars.

And so his work went on until today. Now, Italy came first into touch with Ethiopia about 1868 or '69, right after the Battle of Magdala. In 1870, a group of Italian merchants bought some land on the southern end of the western side of the Red Sea and there established a trading post. By 1888 that post had become so important and they had added so much land to it that the Italian Government bought it and so began the establishment of the Colony of Eritrea. Shortly after that the great Menelik came to the throne and in his attempt to unify Ethiopia and the Italian attempt to penetrate further and further into this country, friction arose between the two parties until the Treaty of Uccialli was formed in 1889 in which the Italians believed that Menelik gave them a protectorate over their country.

Now, the difference arises in the wording between the two versions of the treaty, one in Amharic, and one in Italian. I have never seen the one in Italian but with a friend I examined the one in Amharic about two months ago. So far as we could see there is no word in the Amharic version which indicated beyond a shadow of a doubt that Menelik gave Italy a protectorate over his country and Menelik, the Second, wasn't the kind of man to do that. So, four years after, in 1892, he repudiated that treaty. Then the differences multiplied between these two lands until in 1896 when things got so bad that the two powers found themselves at war at Aduwa (that you have been reading and hearing about) in the northeastern part of the country and there were gathered together 14,500 Italians and 100,000 Ethiopians and of course the Italians were defeated. The Italians never forgot Aduwa and the other day they are supposed to have avenged themselves in the taking of that town.

The next important event after that which has to do with Italy and Ethiopia was in 1902 when Italy, Ethiopia, France and Great Britain, the next interested powers, got together in order to establish the frontiers. There were a series of treaties, ten of them, culminating in 1902 in the establishment of the boundary line between these different countries. In 1906 the same three European countries came together and established spheres of influence in Ethiopia with the consent of the Ethiopian Government.

In 1923, Ethiopia was accepted as a member of the League of Nations — I will have a word to say about that League of Nations business in a few minutes time— and in 1928 Italy and Ethiopia made an agreement, signed a treaty of perpetual friendship in which one of the important clauses was that in the future all matters of dispute should be settled by arbitration. That was in 1928.

Now we come to the issue. Mussolini was successful in Italy. No man has been more successful in any great undertaking than he, and with the passage of time Mussolini had developed what, I suppose, we might call, not unfriendly at all, really a Caesar complex. All his phraseology, all the symbols used in his regime look back to the Roman Empire and in his own words, what he wanted to establish again, bring to life again, was a great Roman Empire. That was his purpose.

Now, he looks about to see where or how that Empire could be established, and believing that at one time Italy had a protectorate over Ethiopia, Ethiopia was a natural country to look to. The question of moral right or wrong didn't concern Mussolini. Of course, he had no moral right at all. Ethiopia was a member of the League of Nations, an independent country, but Mussolini wanted to establish a Roman Empire.

Now, here is another misconception. There was a certain amount of dissatisfaction on the part of Italy after the War, that she didn't get her share of the spoils of the Great War. That is entirely a misconception because there is a little state paper here which contains information that proves — I haven't time to read it — that since the War, Italy received from the Allied Nations in Africa, Great Britain and France especially, areas to the extent of about 200,000 square kilometers. The whole land of Jubaland was given by Great Britain to Italy. In the south of Libya and the east of Libya, regions there were signed to Italy by France and Great Britain. Great Britain signed other portions of Eastern Libya on the border of Egypt to France and a section between Eritrea and French Somaliland was ceded to Italy by France. So Italy received, in contradiction to the general opinion that she received nothing after the War, land to the extent of about 200,000 square kilometers.

Now, in order to justify himself, Mussolini said, "What we need in order to build up this Roman Empire is a place to expand in, a place to colonize in, some place where the Italians can have work," and people seem to forget that already Italy has in Africa about a million square miles of territory, nine times as large as Italy itself and three times as large as Abyssinia, undeveloped, unexploited, with practically no Italians in it. It is not all sand land. It is the same kind of territory as Abyssinia. It is on the south and on the north of mineral wealth. There is oil and places where cotton can be grown, etc., etc. So the argument that they needed a place to expand in was rather an excuse. If Germany said that today they would have some reason. Italy has really no reason.

So he saw that the world didn't take that seriously. The next point was that Ethiopia was committing acts of aggression. Well, there are acts of aggression going on all the time on the borders of such countries as the countries in Africa where people do not know exactly where the border lies and the point Mussolini now emphasized was the trouble that arose last December in Wal Wal. He said, "At Wal Wal, Ethiopia committed an act of aggression on us."

Now, in that conflict last December, 70 Italians were killed and 300 Abyssinians were killed. Now, one would have thought that Italy might have been satisfied with that. Only 70 Italians and 300 Abyssinians. But they were not. Mussolini wanted to use that as a good point. He said, "Now, we will prove that Abyssinia is the aggressor." The League of Nations said, "All right. We will try that," and they appointed a committee, after three or four months had gone by. In June they appointed a Committee and that Committee said, "Naturally, the first thing we have to do is to establish where Wal Wal is. If Wal Wal is in Ethiopia, the Italian soldiers had no business over there. If Wal Wal is in Italian Somaliland, then the Ethiopians had no business there."

Do you know what Mussolini did? He said, "We won't discuss that question," and everybody knows that Wal Wal is at least sixty miles within the Abyssinian boundary. Well, the League, as always, was easy and nice. The League says, "We can't do anything but be nice to you, so as not to drive you out of the League.

We will discuss the question of the aggressor. Who was the agressor at Wal Wal?" They appointed an extra man, a wily Greek, and he came to the conclusion that no one was the aggressor, so of course there was no argument there at all.

Now, Mussolini said, "All right. Abyssinia is a savage country and shouldn't belong to the League of Nations anyhow." That was the next argument. Now, how foolish is that, because Italy was the very country that insisted that Abyssinia be accepted as a member of the League of Nations and England headed the other party in the League of Nations against Ethiopia being accepted as a member of the League of Nations. He said, "Will you please sanction war with Ethiopia?" But that is against the agreement of the Kellog Pact, that one member of the League of Nations should not make war on another member of the League of Nations.

So that is the way he stood. Now, really what Mussolini counted upon was the League. He counted upon the League being the League, as it always had been the League—talking and doing nothing. He thought by the time the League finished talking he would be through with Ethiopia, but he counted without taking into consideration others interested in the situation at this time. The other nation interested in this problem is Great Britain. Now, undoubtedly, Great Britain had selfish reasons. No doubt she did. All nations are selfish, as individuals are selfish and always will be selfish. Great Britain was interested naturally in the sources of the Nile. She was interested in the way to India. She was interested in the question of Egypt and many other questions, but it was so evident to England that here was a clear cut question of right and wrong, of moral right and wrong, of Ethiopia having done no offence, not desiring war and the other country desiring to conquer this country, that she began to do her best to get Italy to try to consider this thing with reason and see what they could give to pacify Mussolini. She was willing to give him another strip of British Somaliland. Mussolini turned that down. He said, "I am not collecting deserts." So nothing was done there.

Well, now Great Britain began to talk about sanctions. She said if we can't do anything we may have to apply sanctions and immediately you remember the storm of protest and abuse of England in the Italian press. "If England wants war she can have it." So things looked rather serious for Great Britain. Not only was there a storm of protest, but Mussolini being a man of action as well as words sent 30,000 troops to Eastern Libya on the border of Egypt. Well, immediately Great Britain sent the fleet out to the Mediterranean. That rather worried Mussolini for a short time. He began immediately to enquire, "Why is the fleet there?" Great Britain said, "The fleet is here not to impose or enforce any sanctions; the fleet is here for defensive purposes and there will be no enforcement of sanctions by Great Britain alone. Such enforcement of sanctions must be collective by all members of the League," Mussolini was assured. Mussolini's position was that if military sanctions weren't applied he could get along with the other things.

Now, the next country interested in this problem is France and one has the greatest sympathy for France. France was certainly in a very difficult position. She was, I suppose, between "Scylla and Charybdis," or, as we would say, "between the devil and the great deep, blue sea." I am not going to indicate which I think was one or the other. At any rate, there she is, and she signed a treaty of friendship with Italy in January of this year. She is particularly frightened of what may happen in Central Europe, not knowing what to do, undecided as to whether she can back up Great Britain or not.

Now, at that stage of the game Mussolini said, "All right." He changed his whole reason. He said, "We are defending our African colonies. We would never think of aggression. We have only 400,000 men in our army. They have 800,000 in theirs. We would never think of committing an act of aggression out there." He said that in so many words. So he said, "All right. We are attacked. We are oppressed out there and we must defend our colonies. Now, so far as economic and financial sanctions are concerned, we are not worrying about them at the present time and unless more than one member of the League of Nations applies military sanctions, then we shan't worry about that because military sanctions by one member of the League (and of course he had one particular member in mind) means war with Italy." So the thing went.

There is another question I ought to refer to before stopping. That is the question of the control of the Suez Canal. There are two treaties that have governed the control of the Suez Canal, the one of 1888 and the other of 1904. According to these treaties the Suez Canal is open to vessels of all kinds, merchant or warships during times of war or peace, with one exception and that is not brought out clearly, and the exception is when there is no danger of aggression on the nation through whose territory the Suez Canal goes.

Now, then, because of that the Suez Canal has been closed three times in its history. Once was during the Great War when on account of the British fleet at both ends of the Suez Canal, no one could get through without her permission.

Now, the legal situation, as you saw by the papers the other day, rendered by the French Jurists is that the canal is to be open always during peace or war, but that nation which controls the entrance outside the limits that would be taken into consideration in a legal blockade is the nation who will close the canal and in case of war—I hope it doesn't come—between Great Britain and Italy, Great Britain would control or would try to control the entrance to both ends of the canal.

Now, what efforts have been made to avoid war? We know the efforts that have been made to avoid the outbreak of war and we know the thesis that was France's from the beginning. One of the reasons why France didn't enthuse more than she did about the different methods suggested for bringing about a cessation of hostilities was that she believed the best thing to do was to allow the war to begin and then let the nations get together and talk. Now, I suppose there probably would be two or three ways in which the war may be brought to an end, now it has started. One of those had to do with the French thesis. That is, as soon as Mussolini thinks his victories are important enough and numerous enough to justify his expense and to satisfy Italy's pride, he will undoubtedly be willing to talk terms of peace. Otherwise the war will go on until Abyssinia is undoubtedly conquered.

In the third place, if two or more members of the League consent to apply military sanctions, Italy could be stopped, but it is very questionable as to whether any more than one member of the League of Nations would be willing to apply military sanctions, so it is hard to tell at the present time in which way or when the present conflict will be ended. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT BRACE: In a period of forty minutes, I think most of us have learned more about Ethiopia and the peoples of that country that we have learned during the previous period of our lifetime. Dr. Mercer has given to us today a story which we all, I am sure, are glad to have. He has dealt with a subject that is very live and I am sure I am expressing on your behalf our hearty appreciation for his message to us today.

VOICES ACROSS THE SEA

AN ADDRESS BY DR. J. O. PERRINE

Thursday, October 17th, 1935

PRESIDENT BRACE: On Monday I received a cablegram from the Honourable Howard Ferguson, regretting that it would be impossible for him to get back to England to keep his engagement with us and to speak from London to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. Mr. Ferguson, as you probably all know, is President of the Canadian delegation sitting at Geneva and it is absolutely essential that he should remain in Geneva during these very trying times.

We appreciate very much having received an acceptance from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, and from the Honourable Howard Ferguson to speak and we regret that we are unable to accomplish this purpose. However, the gods willing, and static conditions not being too serious, through the kindly co-operation of the Canadian Marconi Company, later on during Dr. Perrine's address, we shall have a call established between London and this room. At the London end, Mr. Napier who is in charge of the telephone system for the British Post Office in London, England, will speak. At this end, our immediate Past-President, Mr. Dana Porter and Mr. Dunstan who, I understand, at one time had something to do with the telephone business in Toronto will talk to Mr. Napier.

Some three years ago Dr. Perrine addressed a group in Toronto. I was fortunate in being able to listen to that address. I think what struck most of us was Dr. Perrine's ability to take a highly technical subject and make it understandable to a layman. That requires an ability of a very distinct order.

Dr. Perrine will tell us something of the mysteries surrounding the means for converting sound waves into electrical impulses and transmitting them to some distant definite point and there again translating those electrical impulses back into sound waves. That, of course, is the fundamental theory of telephone engineers.

Dr. Perrine is a graduate of Iowa, Michigan and Cornell Universities. He is associated with a large group of engineers in the American Telephone and Telegraph Comany who for over fifty years, through their research work have been developing the art. Unquestionably, the world owes a great deal to this group of engineers, and it was primarily through their efforts that the communications of the world have been expanded to such a large extent and with such rapidity during the past few years. We acknowledge our debt to them. We and the rest of the world have benefitted. So, while we find that from the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States radio telephone systems radiate to all corners of the earth, we also find that within the British Empire, with its heart at London, its arteries extending to Canada, to Australia, to India and to South Africa, we are building up an "all red" telephone communication system which will be helpful in binding closer together the various nations of the British Commonwealth.

I have very much pleasure in introducing to this audience, Dr. Perrine.

DR. J. O. PERRINE: Mr. Brace, Gentlemen of the Empire Club, Guests: It is very nice to be back in Toronto again. When Mr. Brace extended me this invitation I very happily and eagerly accepted and may I thank the Empire Club for the honour they have accorded the industry which it is my privilege to represent in having a part in your programme of noon meetings. There are many telephone men and women today who are looking after this call we shall have with London and their work, as operators and technicians, of course is made possible through many other telephone men and women in times past. So, I say again, may I thank you for the honour you have accorded these men and women. I am their spokesman.

I have a loud speaker on the platform and I have another one over here, so in my talking to you and in my address, remember the men and women, the engineers, the scientists, the operators and all, and think of me as the loud speaker.

Mr. Brace assures me that I must keep to my schedule and he has done very well so far.

I am reminded of the story of the man who addressed a noon meeting. He was supposed to be on a schedule but he forgot and went quite a way beyond his schedule. After he was quite a way beyond and a good many men had left, one of the membership came up and said, "Please, Sir, this is a little gift to you and when you return to your room at the hotel you can open this package as a gift from the Club."

So, he kept on talking for another half hour or so, concluded and went to his room and opened the little package and there was what appeared to be a watch. He hefted it a bit and it seemed rather light. He opened it and it was a watch case and in the watch case was a note. It said, "If you ever come back, we will give you the works."

So I don't want to violate Mr. Brace's reputation for veracity and his request that I keep to my schedule and I don't want to get the works.

There was one word in Mr. Brace's introduction that I am not at all pleased about—I am not sorry either since it makes possible an important introductory idea—that is the word 'mystery.' I am not going to have anything to do with mysteries because it seems to me that is a very unfortunate word and what I am going to try to do is to have understanding. Mystery suggests black magic and trickery, bags of tricks and hats and long sleeves and that sort of thing. I am not going to do that at all. What I am going to try to do is to help you to understand so that there may not be any mystery about this idea of talking to London.

Then, there is another part about Mr. Brace's introduction that pleases me. He was in Montreal and attended the meeting of the Canadian Engineering Institute where I gave the same talk I am to give now but shall not include so many technical points. Mr. Brace has kindly given a suggestion as to my theme which I had given in Montreal. It is always well to have a theme suggested more than once so that it may better be appreciated by the audience. I am going to try to trace the sequence of events from the time that sound comes out of my mouth, its translation to electric waves in the telephone transmitter then the transmittal of electric waves over wires to Montreal, and wires to Drummondville, and wires on towers, and then by radio waves at the radio receiver, electrical waves again, across the ocean, and there back on wires at Baldock, and thence to London by wire and thence finally to somebody's ear by sound waves.

So, I say, Mr. Brace has already suggested my theme and the transformation and transmittals of waves shall be my objective. I thought it would be interesting to you men from the standpoint of the industries and the professions you represent to make this interesting to you.

The telephone is in the classification of transportation. Fundamentally, our main objective is, as Mr. Brace said, to get the sound out of a subscriber's mouth into another subscriber's ear. Someone has very prettily said, "Words are precious freight." We are in the freight business, and the freight which we carry is words.

So, in this electrical system, we are going to take words, put them on an electric circuit and then put them on a radio circuit across the continent and thence across the ocean. These words that come out of people's mouths are very fragile and very tiny. That is our fundamental problem and concern.

I was chatting with Mr. Dunstan at dinner last night and I thought then, "I shall make reference to him and his long service as an illustration point in my talk." He said in 1878 or '79 he began in the telephone business. If you were to take the electric current that comes in the receivers that you hold to your ear of all the telephone conversations in the Dominion of Canada ever since Mr. Dunstan began in the business, the electric current that embodies this little something in the receiver, if you could take all the electric current of all the calls in the Dominion of Canada since 1878, and put that current through your electric light meter, what bill would the electric light company send you? Five cents. So that something that is going to start across the ocean is very tiny.

I thought it would be interesting to show you, this voice, the sound waves, visually. It is often helpful to supplement our sphere of endeavour in one sense with our experience in another. So I am going from audition to vision. There is from my mouth sound going to your ear. Obviously, something is happening from your ear drum down the auditory nerve to the brain. Something is happening. Can you see that?

I have on the lapel of my coat a microphone and likewise Mr. Brace had one. I am connected to the loud speaker with a long flexible cord so I can move about and take my microphone or telephone transmitter with me. What is going through this wire? Something must be. I know something is. I cannot feel it or see it, but out of the loud speaker comes amplified sound. Could we get into the wire and see electrical current? Could we get into the auditory nerve and see electrical impulses going through to the brain? Could we get out on a ship and see the radio waves sweeping across the water?

So my first experiment is to give you a visual notion of sound and electric waves, so when the call comes, you may visualize then a bit more completely when our call to London is operating. I have an apparatus on the platform which we call an oscillograph. I also have a rotating mirror which I can turn with a motor, and a telephone receiver with a tiny mirror on it. And I have an automobile head-light, a very brilliant light, of course, that shines on the mirror and back to this rotatengone and so finally on the screen. Here is the transmitter. My waves of sound or electric current is being transmitted here and then it goes on through the wire. As I talk the sound waves will be translated into electric current. (Demonstration given by Dr. Perrine.) Now, you see, Gentlemen, if I talk into the telephone here, as I am doing, it makes this tiny spot of light move up and down, with the result that across the screen sweeps an irregular, crooked, changing pattern line, making it possible for you to see this something that is coming out of my mouth or out of the loud speaker's mouth, with these variations of sound. So, I say, if you could get inside and see what is going on from your telephone to the telephone office, this is what it is like.

The operator says, "Number, please?" and you say, "Toronto 674," and she says, "Thank you." (Sound waves being shown on screen.) Very unfortunately, and we hope, very seldom, but once in a while, this comes back: "Wrong Number."

So again, this dancing pattern of light waves depicts the rising and falling of air pressure between my mouth and your ear or the auditory impulses that go down the auditory nerve.

(At this juncture Dr. Perrine demonstrated to his audience the variation in the waves which resulted when the different vowels and consonants were pronounced separately.)

I want to let you hear and see some music, so we shall take away the loud speaker and connect it to a phonograph which I have over here. I shall play a record and out of the loud speaker through which you have been hearing me, you will hear music.

(At this juncture, a phonograph record with instrumental and vocal music was played so that the audience heard it from a loud speaker. The room was darkened and a hand telephone was held in front of the loud speaker.

The "625" transmitter was connected to the oscillograph so the audience heard and likewise saw the sound variations.)

It is interesting to reflect that Alexander Graham Bell had the thought that he could help deaf people to know what is being said if he could get something like this on a screen. He made such waves as you see here. He didn't have the facilities which I very happily have, but imagine that all of you were deaf and I woud speak to you by these waves. I would speak to your ears, as it were, through your eyes. Of course the idea was never realized. We haven't had enough eye practice through several eons of time.

As we watch the waves and realize what our eyes and lips and teeth do, I am reminded of a sentence I heard as a boy. It was this: "To one who does not reflect on the nature of the world about him, language is accepted as a matter of course, but to the scholar the amazing phenomena of articulate speech come home as a kind of every day miracle." I think that is very pretty: "The amazing phenomena of articulate speech come home as an every day miracle."

Now, just by way of contrast, I want to have you hear some other kinds of sounds, other than speech and to do that I have have some tuning forks here which I am going to connect up with my loud speaker. I have on the table now another one of my lapel microphones. (The tuning forks were struck individually and collectively. It was demonstrated how three tuning forks going together helped to produce a composite tone.)

The tone produced by these three tuning forks is a bit like an organ. Literally speaking, this voice of mine is made up, because in my teeth and lips and tongue and vocal cords, I have the facilities, as have all people who have vocal facilities, of those tuning forks which make the various sounds we call speech.

...(Further slides were shown, demonstrating the effect on both speech and music when certain vibrations were removed. It was shown that when the very low vibrations were taken out of human speech, although it was harsh and displeasing to the ear, it was still intelligible. One could still catch the vowels and consonants. When the higher vibrations were removed, it was not always possible to detect what was being said, although the sound was not displeasing. The following sentences were repeated with the various high and low vibrations removed: Alexander Poe said, "Things must be taught as though you taught them not; and things unknown be taught as though forgot." Alexander Poe also recommended: "Speak, though sure, with seeming diffidence.")

So, Gentlemen, this something speaks. Words are precious freight and they can get wrecked very readily. One thing that wrecks is static. One is long wires. The sheer fact of wires running alongside of one another does this sort of thing if one doesn't do something so it won't. What I have shown you artificially done is what happens if we don't look out that it doesn't happen.

The next experiment I want to do is to call Montreal and that has to do with the signs that are above you. When this thing called speech gets on the air or the ether, these radio waves may be picked up by radio receivers, so we inject into this system en route across the ocean the element of privacy. We manipulate it so we control, not in any mysterious fashion, but in a very straightforward understanding fashion we manoeuvre the frequency so it will be confused en route if anyone was listening. I have had this sign made to illustrate what I am talking about a bit. (A large sign with the word 'Canada' was shown.) If you look at that from the back, then it becomes 'Adanac,' perhaps. Of course, that isn't right, because the D isn't a D, and the N isn't an N, and the C isn't a C. Could I do that with speech, Could I invert and make the low part of the vibrations become the high part and the high part the low part? How could that be made to read correctly? If I had a mirror and you looked in the mirror, what would you see here? Canada.

Did you ever write a note to your girl that way when you were a young boy, writing the letters backward and spelling it backward, and she looked in the mirror and read the message?

I have a friend in Boston who can write his name that way with great facility. You look in the mirror and there is the name—John Jones.

That is what we are going to do in a way with words, and have an electrical mirror, if you will permit me to use that analogy, and here are some of the effects of that. We call it an electrical inverter and when the waves are going across the ocean we put them in this cryptic language and the electric mirror in London will look at them, if you will.

Now, I am going to call this young man in Montreal. He has a whistle—it is a musical affair, such as they have in orchestras sometimes. He has one up there. He is going to blow it and the apparatus will do what I say, make the high frequencies low and low frequencies high.

We will call the young man in Montreal:

DR. PERRINE: Long Distance, this is Dr. Perrine, at the meeting of the Empire Club at the Royal York Hotel. Will you connect me through to the toll test board in Montreal. Mr. Pringle, please.

OPERATOR: Certainly, Dr. Perrine.

DR. PERRINE: Mr. Pringle, please. Hello, Mr. Pringle. This is Dr. Perrine.

MR. PRINGLE: How do you do, Dr. Perrine.

DR. PERRINE: How do you do. I am a few minutes behind schedule, so will you go ahead as we rehearsed and do your cryptographic language for us a bit?

MR. PRINGLE: Yes, I will. First, by means of this whistle, I will try to give a sound of rising pitch.

(Sound given.)

Now, I will give you the same sound through the inverter. You will notice it is greatly reduced. (demonstrated.) I will now try a sound of falling pitch, and now the same sound of falling pitch through the inverter. This will be reproduced as a sound of rising pitch.

We will now experiment with the words, "Empire Club of Canada, Toronto." I will speak these words through the inverter and you will notice they are changed to entirely different words or sounds. Now, if I can speak the words you have just heard through the inverter they should come out with some degree of intelligibilty as "Empire Club of Canada, Toronto."

(The words, "Empire Club of Canada, Toronto," as translated through the inverter were shown on the screen as, "Unpaler Kled Aus Komibah Payrampay.")

And, now, "Greeting from the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. Through the inverter it came as "Groopooings fram thoo doyee Playofine Crinkinope Aus Komibah.")

And, "Greetings from the Canadian Marconi Company," and we will speak these same words through the inverter. The inverted speech equivalent: "Groopoongs fram thoo Komobooahn Norkaymal Crinkinope.")

Now, I will try the little nursery rhyme, "Mary had a Little Lamb." (The nursery rhyme also repeated.)

Dr. Perrine: Hello, Mr. Pringle. You are quite a cryptologist. I will confer an LL.D. or something on you. Thank you so much for your help here and at Montreal the other night.

Mr. Pringle: Thank you, Dr. Perrine.

Dr. Perrine: Good-bye.

Mr. Pringle: Good-bye.

Dr. Perrine: Now, you must understand, Gentlemen, that it is very difficult to get these equivalents. You must listen many times to it and to have good imagination to an approximate equivalent. So, in other words, the electrical mirror does better than the human brain does in converting these one way or the other. Mr. Pringle does very well, I think. I have a friend who entertains himself very nicely on the train going in and out of New York by doing crytograms. I gave him one of these the other night and I said, "What can you make out of this?" He came to me the next morning and he said, "Perrine, I can't make out this one at all." Inverted language has no meaning at all to the cryptologist's art.

Now, for our call. First, the geography of it. Here is a slide showing the technical operator's position in Montreal. Here is the radio transmitter at Drummondville, of the Canadian Marconi Company.

You remember this little tiny voice took so little current in your electric light meter. You must have it very sizeable, very large, and that means amplification by instrument called an amplifier and these elements in an amplifier are called vacuum tubes. If we were looking for a keystone, this keystone would be this glass assembly of gas and electricity. How electricity functions in a vacuum has lead to much practical progress. Here is a tube (tube shown.) There must be this gradual approach to this idea of getting the voice very, very large in going across the ocean. You might make this little analogy. It is something like playing contract bridge—the one over one system. The voice out of my mouth is a 'one club'. My partner says, "One diamond." Here is one diamond. (Illustrating.) I respond with "two hearts." He says, "Three spades," and three of these might be three spades, and finally, one over one, we arrive at 'Seven no trump' and there we are The theory is that we want to approach this great power by gradual steps.

This slide shows the transmitting station. Here we are across the ocean—Toronto, Montreal, Drummondville—across the stretch of the sea to London.

The next slide here shows the radio receiver at Baldock, near London. Here a person's voice after it has come over the long journey is very, very tiny, and here it is built up until it is sizeable enough to send to London on wire.

Here is a slide showing the London trans-oceanic operating position in the British Post Office, London. This next slide shows some of the main trunk line circuits of telephones, which are very satisfactory and give excellent service to all parts of Europe.

There are today 33,000,000 telephones in the world and by these lines of radio between them, in your British Empire, from London to Australia and South Africa and all, 92 per cent. of all the telephones of the world among the 2 billions of people can be connected. So any telephone can reach any other telephone in 92 per cent of the world.

The next slide shows the antennae system of the British Post Office at Rugby. They are of the directive or beam antennae systems. They lie directly at right angles to the directive to Canada and send the waves west of Rugby. Wires are hung on the front surface and on the back surface. It is very interesting and very surprising, though no mystery, if you hang wires or a curtain of wires on one side of the towers, and on the side away from Canada, and a certain distance away hang another set of wires, in a curtain, just like the front set, what happens? The power of the radiated electric waves are better toward Canada than in any other direction. That is the reflection idea. It is very fascinating how it can be brought about. The hanging curtain is a reflector of electric waves and reminds one of a light reflector.

Coming back to Yamachiche where the Canadian Marconi station is. Here is the radio receiver at Yamachiche, near Montreal, and it comes back to Toronto by wire.

Now, for our call. I believe, in Toronto, to get long distance, you call 110, and I believe Mr. Napier will be at the phone. (Dr. Perrine called long distance.)

OPERATOR: This is long distance.

DR. PERRINE: This is Dr. Perrine at the Empire Club Meeting. I have arranged for a call to go through to

London, England, to Mr. Napier of the British Post Office. Will you ask the Montreal Operator to put that through?

OPERATOR: Thank you, Dr. Perrine. I will do so.

Montreal Operator, Dr. Perrine at the Royal York Hotel, in Toronto, is reporting ready to talk on his call to London, England.

MONTREAL OPERATOR: Thank you. I will complete the call immediately and call you.

TORONTO OPERATOR: Dr. Perrine, I have informed the trans-Atlantic operator of your desire that the call be put through to London and in a moment I will call you back.

DR. PERRINE: You will call me back, will you, Operator?

TORONTO OPERATOR: Yes, I will.

DR. PERRINE: While I am awaiting the call, there is a little story I heard this morning which may be apropros of our talk. It seems that a Scotch Minister came to America and at an Armistice celebration was asked to make a prayer on November 11th at 11.00 o'clock in the morning. So he stood up and said something like this: "Dear Lord, we are grateful for the beauty, and so forth of this day, for the bravery of the men who served in the Great War, and the memory of those who gave their lives in the Great War and we are not unmindful that at this very moment our kinsmen across the sea are also standing in reverent prayer. However, Lord, Thou knowest that there is a difference of five hours in time.' (Laughter.)

(At this juncture the telephone rang.)

DR. PERRINE: Hello, Mr. Napier.

MR. NAPIER: Hello, Dr. Perrine.

DR. PERRINE: Good afternoon.

MR. NAPIER: Good evening. It is now about a minute past seven.

DR. PERRINE: How are you over there today?

MR. NAPIER: Very well, thank you. We have a beautiful day here, plenty of sunshine and very mild weather. Just a little like your Indian summer, you know.

DR. PERRINE: I didn't know you had Indian summer in England.

MR. NAPIER: We imagine it's Indian summer.

DR. PERRINE: Do you know my friend, Mr. Morehouse in London.

MR. NAPIER: I know him very well, indeed. I knew him over 30 years ago when he came over on vacation work with the National Telephone Company.

DR. PERRINE: You remember me to him, will you please? And, Mr. Napier, I have the honour of introducing to you on the phone, Mr. Dunstan, formerly of the Telephone Company in Toronto and it is said he started the first telephone exchange outside of the United States. He is a very grand old man in Toronto. I would like to have you exchange greetings.

MR. NAPIER: Tell me, what did you say his name was?

DR. PERRINE: Dunstan.

MR. NAPIER: I have got it. O.K.

MR. DUNSTAN: Hello. All you have to do Mr. Napier, is think of St. Dunstan, and naturally, you think of me.

MR. NAPIER: I am very pleased indeed to have a talk with you, Mr. Dunstan.

MR. DUNSTAN: It has been my great privilege to be connected with the telephone, practically from its inception. In 1878 I opened the first exchange in the world outside of the United States, and within one month of being the first in the world, so I have lived through the whole of its marvellous history.

Now, Mr. Napier, I have read with much interest from time to time the reports of the wonderful progress of the art in England and your wonderful progress during the years of depression. I am sure it would interest this very large audience if you would say to us and to them a few words with respect to the progress and perhaps, especially, with regard to international communications and its effect upon world matters.

MR. NAPIER: Well, Mr. Dunstan, as I think you know, over there, just as we know about your system over here, we have been developing very rapidly in all sorts of ways. We have added very materially to the number of subscribers, for example, of the London Telephone Service, and last year, in spite of the fact that things were perhaps not as good as they might have been, we have been making increases in telephones of over 71,000. This year, so far we are considerably above that rate and we expect in the London area we will probably have an increase of not less than probably some seventy or more telephone stations. The automatic system, as you know, is being introduced pretty rapidly in the London area and in Great Britain, generally. We are adding automatic exchanges and the public are taking pretty well to them and they prefer the system to the manual system. We are developing a good deal in the way of residential business, that is telephones in private houses and we have done a very great deal in the way of extending private branch exchange offices and we have some very large private branch exchanges.

You people who are Canadian or American, may be interested in the firm of Selfridge in London. They have a very large private exchange with about 140 exchange lines and I think some 900 or so extensions and they have a private branch exchange switch-board of twenty-one operators.

That is typical of the sort of thing that is going on in the big London business houses and in many of the big stores in London. In all departments they depend very largely for their business on orders received from customers by telephone and some of the big stores have quite elaborate order departments, something along the line of the big order departments you have on the other side of the water. Yes, we have one of our largest departmental stores that on a record day will have between

50 and 60 thousand orders on their order wire in one day.

Mr. Dunstan. I am sure that is very, very interesting. I wish we had the time to elaborate. Of course, time is the essence and I congratulate you on the progress you have made.

Do you happen to know that the first operator in England was the somewhat celebrated Samuel Insull, and one of the first operators in England was the no less celebrated George Bernard Shaw

Mr. Napier: No, I don't think I did know that. I know George Bernard Shaw but I didn't know he was a telephone operator.

Mr. Dunstan: Samuel Insull, on the 1st day of January, 1879 received a communication from the Edison Company in America which led to the formation of his whole career, and I have a letter from George Bernard Shaw, in which he states he was an operator for a short time, from November, 1878.

Mr. Napier: That is very interesting, indeed. I think Mr. George Bernard Shaw has got a better job now. He is able to make more money out of writing books and plays, I think—

Mr. Dunstan: Yes.

Mr. Napier: —than out of telephone operating. Personally I think he ought to get much more money as a telephone operator than a writer, but the rest of the world doesn't think so.

Mr. Dunstan: Unfortunately, Dr. Perrine is at the door here, telling me I have got to shut up.

I wish to convey to you the greetings of this large audience, to yourself, personally, and to dear old London, the centre of the British Empire, and to thank you and to say how much pleasure it has given me. I hope to be in England next summer again. If I do, I may have the pleasure of calling on you.

I am afraid I shall have to say good-bye, not from my own inclination, but because Dr. Perrine is standing over me.

Mr. Napier: Good-bye.

Dr. Perrine: Hello, Mr. Napier. Did you hear that applause?

Mr. Napier: I did.

Dr. Perrine: Very good. We might call that a handclap across the sea.

Now, Mr. Napier, I would like to have you exchange greetings with Mr. Porter, the former President of The Empire Club of Canada. In just a minute, Mr. Porter will be here.

Mr. Dana Porter: Good evening, Mr. Napier.

Mr. Napier: Good evening, Mr. Porter.

Mr. Dana Porter: Is the telephone system of the City of London a beneficient monopoly, such as the Bell Telephone Company of Canada?

Mr. Napier: Well, as you know, the Telephone System of London is in the hands of the British Post Office and so, I suppose, we have what you would call a monopoly, but I don't think we allow that to in any way affect our relations with the public, and we are doing our best to give the public what they want and the class of service they want.

Mr. Dana Porter: Of course the Bell Telephone Company of Canada is doing exactly the same thing. If I said anything else my telephone would be discontinued.

Mr. Napier: I quite believe it. I haven't been much in Canada but I had the pleasure of visiting the United States some years ago and I know a good deal of what is going on on the other side of the border and I have a very high appreciation of what all you people do in the telephone world. We, I think, would not be as advanced in so many ways if we had not copied your methods and we believe your arrangements are usually very sound and well worth considering.

Mr. Dana Porter: I am afraid our conversation will have to be brought to a close. It is indicated that the time is up. This is the longest long distance telephone conversation I have ever had. Well, I musn't keep you any longer. Good-bye, Mr. Napier.

Mr. Napier: Good-bye, Mr. Porter. (Applause.)

Dr. Perrine: Hello, Mr. Napier.

Mr. Napier: Is that Dr. Perrine?

Dr. Perrine: Yes. It has been very good of you to come down and exchange greetings and tell about the telephone exchange service in Great Britain and I assure you the Club will thank you for your courtesy and co-operation in this connection and for the courtesy of the Canadian Marconi Company.

I shall wish "Good afternoon" to you.

Mr. Napier: I am very much obliged to you for giving me the opportunity and it is a very great pleasure for me to talk to you on this occasion.

Dr. Perrine: It is as much a pleasure to me as to you, I am sure.

I will borrow the English phrase and say, "Cheerio."

Mr. Napier: Cheerio, and Good Luck. (Applause.)

Dr. Perrine: Now, I have just a moment, Gentlemen.

Some time ago there was in Great Britain a great enterprise completed, namely the building of a tunnel under the Mersey River at Liverpool and on that occasion the King of England was there and made some remarks apropos of the completion of that great enterprise. It was reported in the New York papers. I read it, it struck my fancy and I wrote it down and I learned it and this is what the King said: "May I praise the imaginations that foresaw, the minds that planned, the skill that fashioned, the will that drove and the strong arms that endured in bringing this to pass." (Applause.)

I think that is very beautiful: The imaginations that foresaw, the minds that planned, the skill that fashioned, the will that drove and the strong arms that endured.

I take it we might say the same thing about this enterprise of talking from Canada to Great Britain. Likewise, of these telephone men and women, their imaginations foresaw, their minds had planned, their skill had fashioned, their will had striven, and the strong arms of the linemen had endured.

May I again thank you, Gentlemen, for this privilege of coming and having a part in your programme. I shall say, "Good afternoon." (Hearty applause.)

PRESIDENT BRACE: Gentlemen, first let me say to Sir Joseph Flavelle and Mr. Eaton, and through them to the Canadian Marconi Company how much we appreciate their assistance in making it possible to have this demonstration overseas so successfully.

Dr. Perrine, I gladly withdraw the word 'mystery.' If mystery is not what he was bringing out of the bag, there is something magical about it. Some of us may still feel that there was something very mysterious but we have learned a great deal from the method in which Dr. Perrine has developed and solved these mysteries.

I don't know that there is any particular phase of this address and demonstration that one could take out and say was the keynote. It is true, it is the second time I have had the opportunity of hearing Dr. Perrine on this subject. One of the interesting facts to me which wasn't developed in Montreal, was to see that beautiful Oxford accent of Mr. Dana Porter on the screen. (Applause.)

I am sure you will all join with me in extending to Dr. Perrine our very hearty thanks for this very illuminating address and demonstration. (Applause.)

GERMANY PREPARES FOR CONQUEST

An Address by LT.-COL. GEORGE A. DREW

Thursday, October 31*st,* 1935

President: I do not propose today to introduce our guest speaker to you. Colonel Drew is known to all of you, firstly, as a Past President of this Club; and, secondly, as a very distinguished writer. During the past few years he has written many important works in connection with the subject of Disarmament. That subject will probably be dealt with today in relation to his visit to the Old Land and to Europe. Thirdly, as you all know, Colonel Drew is a very effective speaker. He has addressed many organizations, both in Canada and the United States and, I presume, likewise in the Old Land and, in general, he has dealt with those subjects which are of concern to all the loyal subjects of His Majesty, the King. And, fourthly, and I am now talking particularly to our unknown lady listeners, it is well known that Colonel Drew is one of our brilliant, handsome, young bachelors.

Last Spring, subsequent to a serious illness, Colonel Drew visited the Old Land and Europe and spent some months there. He has returned and today he is going to give us some of his impressions as a result of investigations such as only Colonel Drew could make. He will deal with the subject: "Germany Prepares for Conquest."

I understand Colonel Drew is now back permanently with us in Toronto and will shortly resume his law practice. We will all be very glad to have him here, not only as a guest but as a permanent resident of this City. (Applause.)

COLONEL DREW: Mr. President and Members of The Empire Club: We are today living through one of the greatest, one of the most far-reaching events in the history of the world. The next few weeks will decide whether the principle of collective enforcement of peace, which was the dream of those who signed the Treaty of Versailles is to become a reality, or whether we are to see the present amassing of arms lead us down the road to destruction.

The day before yesterday Canada took an extremely important step when Mr. King announced that we subscribed to the principle of sanctions, along with thirty-six other nations, imposed on Italy as an aggressor nation. This is the first real test there has been of the theory which underlies the whole foundation of the League of Nations and if that united action does, as I know we all hope. stop Italy in its barbarous onslaught on Ethiopia, then I believe a new day will have dawned in the principle of international justice in the world.

But that will only be the beginning. If, as we all hope, Italy should withdraw its forces from Ethiopia, we will still be a long way from having assured that peace for which so many million men died a comparatively few years ago. There is a more important threat to world peace today than Italy. Just as a small nation started the Great War, or rather was the spark which set flame to that combustible mass of feeling that had been built up, just in the same way, Italy, conceivably, tomorrow or a week from tomorrow might by some overt act begin another world war, but Italy is not the real menace to world peace today. That menace is Germany.

I do not say that because I believe Germany is necessarily our enemy but because of the inescapable fact that German preparation for war far surpasses that of Italy and that there is no comparison between the military effectiveness of the two nations. Italy may precipitate trouble and Mussolini, carried away by a megalomania such as the world has never seen, may be prepared to sacrifice a whole nation to his own aim and, with a controlled press, with an anti-British feeling stirred to a depth of bitterness which we can hardly understand, it is possible that he may do that. But Italy is not the threat because every Italian who has that feeling of bitterness for England, and now for France as well, realizes also that the moment Italy starts war they have taken the first step to destruction.

With Germany the picture is entirely different. We see the same form of totalitarian government under the control of an absolute dictator supported by a completely controlled press, radio and moving picture organization, but there the similarity ends. Mussolini has done amazing things with a people who are naturally peace-loving, easy-going, more inclined to the ways of peace than those of war, but far away though we are, we should remember, we must remember, that Hitler, who has copied Mussolini's form of government, has under his control a nation that has been accustomed to discipline, both personal and economic, for many, many years.

In each nation propaganda plays its important part, but propaganda in Germany is something entirely different from that in Italy and in the development of his propaganda Hitler has the assistance of able lieutenants. You do not see the same thing in Italy at all. In Italy, if anyone raises his head and would appear to detract from the shining glory of Mussolini himself, he becomes an envoy of a foreign power, but Hitler has that genius for in some way gathering to himself all the power and all the glory that is built up by those very able men who surround him.

Just before going to Germany last summer I saw a German moving picture that seemed to me peculiarly significant of the mental attitude and the development of the propaganda organization in Germany. It was called, "The Young and the Old King." It was an amazingly distorted story of the training of Frederick the Great by his father. Frederick the Great's training was not such as most young kings would expect, but it was an entirely different training than that depicted in this picture in which Emil Jannings took the leading part. In that picture, one of unrelieved gloom and cruelty, you had the story of young Frederick, more interested in playing the flute than in following the teaching of arms and, finally, under the brutality of his father, he decided to escape and to give up his hope of becoming king. To aid him in that escape he enlisted the support of a young lieutenant in the same regiment, named Von Katte. The plot being discovered, Von Katte was arrested, was tried by court martial and sentenced to life imprisonment. In this moving picture, from which the word 'Propaganda' fairly screamed from every line, Frederick the Great's father tore up the judgment of the court martial and ordered Von Katte's execution. The execution was carried out before young Frederick himself, so he should understand the stern realities of his duty as a coming king of Germany. Then you have the picture at the death-bed of Frederick the Great's father, when Frederick the Great goes to Frederick William and tells him that he realizes now that no matter what cruelty there may be, the end justifies the means and that through that act of supreme cruelty he had become the great soldier and statesman that he then was. It did not need to be said in the picture itself, but all the way through you felt that Dr. Goebbels was justifying the Blood Purge of June, 1934. You could see June, the 30th, 1934, standing out in every line and having seen that picture, when I went to Germany, I did expect to find something of that atmosphere of cold cruelty that seemed to be pictured by this evidence of their propaganda.

Instead of that the picture was entirely different. There is, it is perfectly true, a picture of rigid efficiency everywhere. From the time I landed at the Tempelhofer Airport to the time I left there I saw nothing but disciplined organization, but at the same time a very real evidence of contentment, assurance, confidence, and an obvious belief that that which they were doing was right.

Strangely enough, I found that the courtesy of the Customs officials at the Tempelhofer Airport was very much greater than the courtesy of our own Customs officials, through whom I passed a few days ago. Strangely enough, with all the rigour one finds in Germany, or is supposed to find, I found that generally the customs enforcement is not nearly so severe as one is expected to believe.

Underneath it all there are sinister backgrounds that one cannot actually touch, that one cannot really appreciate because there is no question about the rigorous discipline that is imposed. It is very rarely that one finds a German perfectly free to discuss what he actually thinks about the situation. There are, of course, the two great problems which have aroused such strong feeling in Great Britain and elsewhere throughout the English-speaking world, the utterly unforgivable treatment of the Jews and the supposed suppression of religion in Germany, but insofar as one can see things in Germany it is rather difficult actually to find any evidence of these rather important developments in their national history. True, you may go out on the waters above Berlin, along the Wannsee and the Havel, and see the chateau where Einstein used to live and from which he was driven as a man unworthy of Berlin citizenship, and which was given to an actress as a person more worthy of Berlin recognition than Einstein. It is true, you may see synagogues closed, but it is only by chance if you see any real evidence of the cruelty there has been, but there can be no question about the amazing depth to which that anti-Jewish sentiment has gone. It is taking at the present time a form that is not so visible but is extremely effective of refusing licences to Jewish traders and in that way, of course, preventing the very means of their livelihood and that suppression of the living occupations of the Jewish citizens of Germany is undoubtedly being greatly intensified.

Strangely enough, there are exceptions. I was very interested to meet in Berlin a representative of the Krupp Armament Company who is a Jew, a very charming, well-educated Jew, and he is a good salesman of armaments. He had just returned from Turkey and was on his way to Russia. His relationship to the German state was too important to apply the same principle to him as in other cases. Those exceptions do occur in Germany, as elsewhere.

Another thing I had been led to expect was some evidence of the suppression of religion and, particularly, of the Roman Catholic faith, because in the English press, as you know, the Archbishop of Canterbury and other leading British Divines have taken a very vigorous position in regard to the restraint that has been imposed upon the free performance of religious ceremonies within the German State. I must confess that I am in some doubt as to whether we really know the exact situation there, as to whether the press reports are entirely correct. Before I went to Germany, I had been led to believe that Cardinal Faulhaber, the leading Roman Catholic Cardinal in Germany, was under some measure of restraint, practically under arrest for some statements he had made. I happened on Corpus Christi day, to be in Munich, a city with over eighty per cent of the population Roman Catholic, and there I saw the largest and most impressive procession, and taking his full and proper place, in his ecclesiastical garments, was Cardinal Faulhaber. His body-guard was some 20,000 of the permanent force troops and all along the road were detachments of the permanent force troops. In other words, you have the actual German co-operation of the State in its military form with this procession.

What the answer is I cannot say, but in Roman Catholic churches in Munich that day I saw, as far as I could see, a complete freedom of expression so far as religion was concerned.

But it is not only in such things as that that we find these amazing contrasts. I doubt if there is any country in the world today that presents such striking contrasts as does Germany. On the one hand you have a great military power being rebuilt. On the other hand you have a city that is literally filled with music. There is music in the air everywhere. As you walk along the streets at night there are actually hundreds of excellent orchestras playing. Without going into any of the cafes where they play one can hear good music, can hear singing, can hear this evidence of a taste for the finer things.

Again, one finds, in Berlin particularly, an abstemiousness, a discipline that one perhaps has not been led to expect. Certainly the old typical German beer drinker is to be found in Berlin only as an exception. The main occupation in Berlin after the day's work is over seems to be talking, talking, talking about politics and the Party. In these cafes where thousands sit at night you see healthy, vigorous looking people sitting for hours listening to the music, drinking, perhaps, a small stein of beer or a glass of wine and nothing more, and if one is to appreciate the picture and to understand what has taken place, one should realize that perhaps nowhere is there a people as physically fit as the German people today. They have made a fetish of physical fitness. At noon on Saturday they go to the country, those who are not in uniform, and on the waterways throughout the country you see them paddling in their canoes, walking along the roads everywhere, becoming the brown fit people that they really are. Walking through the streets of Berlin it is a stimulating sight to see these vigorous, healthy people whose rotundity does not in any way correspond with the German picture that we have had in the past.

Another thing which, I must admit, struck me very forcibly in Berlin was the absence of those formal German salutes that we have been led to expect. In Berlin, where the seat of government is, I didn't hear a

"Heil Hitler" once the whole time I was there. One occasionally saw the right arm raised in a somewhat casual salute, such as we might give ourselves, but that is only one example, one evidence of the fact that it is extremely dangerous to come to sudden conclusions in Germany today because when you get away from Berlin, particularly to the south of Germany, "Heil Hitler" is exactly like "Good day." A man goes into a store, raises his right arm and says "Heil Hitler" and the clerks behind the counter reply "Heil Hitler," and perhaps there is good reason why they should do so. Everywhere one sees posters; the German people have developed the use of posters perhaps more than any other nation. Everywhere you see posters: "The Salute of the German People is 'Heil Hitler'."

Again, one might be misled as to the extent of the military training in Berlin. From Monday morning to Saturday at noon there is not an unusual evidence of military uniforms. True, you see a great many more than you will in London or in New York or anywhere in Canada, but you won't see as many as you will in Rome or in the other continental capitals in relation to the population: but on Saturday at noon the picture changes completely and at noon it seems that everybody gets into uniform and people come out in the Brownshirt uniform, children and girls and boys. In every vacant lot around Berlin and other cities of Germany you see people drilling and drilling efficiently, and that is a part of the training which is usually ignored in discussing German military strength. Germany today has a permanent force army of some 650,000 men, as large or a little larger than France's. Beyond that is a very highly trained force, the Brownshirts, of perhaps a million—no one outside of the German officials know how many—who are efficient troops and could be thrown into action very shortly after a war began. That is a fact which must be taken into consideration in thinking of German military power.

But far more important than this visible evidence of training, far more important even than the realization of the fact that they have nearly a million men in training in their permanent force, their conscript labour organizations which are really military training camps, their navy and their air force and in addition to that perhaps another million Brownshirts, far more important than that is the extremely efficient centralization of authority in Berlin itself.

In the days before the Great War the various kingdoms of Germany were not entirely in harmony with each other at all times and each was exceedingly proud of its own tradition. Bavaria was a kingdom with far more ancient lineage than that of Berlin. It was proud of its position, proud of its tradition, but when Hitler came into power one of his first steps was to suspend completely the authority of the provincial governments which had succeeded those kingdoms.

In the famous Brown House which is the Nazi party headquarters in Munich, I was discussing some of these things with a leading Nazi official who, incidentally, spoke the sort of English that almost made one wonder whether one hadn't better go back to school oneself. He was an Oxford graduate, a delightful man to meet in every way, and exceptionally well informed about American and Canadian politics. I asked him if there wasn't some resentment of this loss of authority on the part of the provinces or states which were so short a time ago proud kingdoms. He said, "No. Every German today realizes that it was inefficient, that it was unsound." He said, "We had nearly as great a confusion of government as you have in Canada." (Laughter.) So, after all, the criticisms aren't entirely on one side.

Now, undoubtedly under that centralization of authority there have been great things accomplished. But it is in that centralization that the menace lies. They are building great highways, great public works, but all those public works and particularly all those highways are subordinated to the theory of military expediency.

Another thing that is very noticeable throughout the whole of Germany is the almost feverish activity in developing the production of food stuffs that will make them self supporting. Everywhere now you see wheat being grown, every inch of land being used to the very limit of its fertility. Germany remembers the food shortage of the last years of the war and they are determined not to have that experience repeated if it is at all possible.

Then they have what is extremely interesting, this great Ersatz programme, a programme of substitution by scientific means of those things that cannot be produced in Germany itself and which they have previously imported. In most cases the cost of producing these things is beyond all comparison above those of the imported articles but that, quite obviously, has no bearing at all on a nation so determined as Germany is today to make itself all-powerful from a military point of view.

As an example, most of the gasoline produced in Germany is produced by their hydrogenation process from coal. Most of the tires, nearly all the tires on German automobiles, are made of synthetic rubber. Clothes are being made from wood; sugar is being made from wood, even today in times of peace. Nitrates for fertilizers and explosives are being produced by the breaking down of nitrogen from the air. In every direction science, and after all German science is particularly efficient, science has become the hand-maiden of military power.

Germany is devoting more and more attention to the development of her air fleet. All air craft production is centralized under an authority in Berlin which cooperates with the Air Ministry. Their great all-metal Junker planes are not as comfortable, not as luxurious, as those of the Imperial Airways, the Dutch K.L.M., or the Air France, but they are bombers, convertible at a moment's notice.

I was flying down from Berlin to Nuremberg and I had no knowledge of the type of plane I was flying in. I simply got a ticket on the seven o'clock plane in the morning. We took off in a head wind, flew in a head wind and flew down without varying our course directly into Nuremberg. I looked at my watch; we had covered 390 kilometers in an hour and a quarter, having averaged a speed of over 200 miles an hour. I asked what the machine was. There was a friend of mine there with whom I was discussing this and he said, "So you came down in one of the bombers, did you? They are the bombers, one of the new Heinkel machines, the fastest commercial machine in the world. They are the standard fast bombers of Germany today and are being poured out as fast as air craft workshops can pour them, working day and night."

Everywhere throughout Germany you see posters emphasizing the importance of aviation. You see posters: "Hitler say, 'Every German Youth Should Fly'," and it is amazing the numbers that are. They are watching air port lines all over Europe. The German lines are incomparably the most efficient and the best organized in Europe today. It may not be a palatable thing for us to accept, but the fact remains, they are the very best and most efficient air lines in Europe today and it is no wonder that the capitals of Europe are terrified at the prospect. When you can fly from London to Berlin in about three hours, when you can hop from Munich to Venice in an hour and a half or an hour and forty minutes over the Bavarian Alps, when you can come from inland Italy to Zurich in Switzerland over the Alps in about an hour and a half, you begin to realize the menace of aviation in Europe today. With the addition of their great chemical plants and their air craft production, Europe has good reason to be fearful of the air craft development in Germany.

Strangely enough, Hitler does not seem to in any way avoid the opportunities that other men under him may have to glorify themselves. Goering is a great showman. Goebells is not a showman but a very efficient propagandist. Schacht and Von Blomberg and Beck all take their important places.

It is a rather healthy sign that there is a certain amount of humour in Germany in relation to some of these men. No one jokes about Hitler but Goebbels is popularly known as "Mickey Mouse," and the stories about Goering I wouldn't dare repeat at The Empire Club or to those people who might be listening over the air. There are many amusing stories illustrating his fondness for show. One story is that Goering was supposed to be walking along the street with his dog. A friend meeting him said, "A new medal on your uniform?" Goering looked down and said, "Heavens above, I have a dog tag on there." So on the stories about Goering go but they seem to popularize him and that is one of the things in the propaganda about the German people today.

No one should think for a moment that the German people are not behind Hitler. They are, in spite of the Blood Purge. We would think a thing of that kind would alienate sympathy throughout the whole country. Germans to whom I spoke said it stopped too soon, they thought of several others it might have worked on very well. After all, one must realize there is a spirit of medieval cruelty in the German people which we do not understand, and perhaps it is a good thing in its way, but they are prepared to subordinate every other activity to the welfare of the State and they simply feel that it was a good thing that people causing trouble or who might have caused trouble were done away with. But if you were a German living in Germany you might well have reason to feel the way the Germans do. One must remember that in an amazingly short time Hitler has raised the German people from a discouraged and abject nation to a position of courage, of confidence and of arrogance again. In an amazingly short time he has repudiated all the obligations of the Treaty of Versailles, has developed one of the largest, if not the largest army in Europe, is building a powerful navy and has built up probably the most powerful air force in the world. Unemployment has been greatly reduced, based largely on rearmament, industry all over Germany, except in a few localities, is very active. I think it is quite correct to say that at no time in the history of the world has there been such a sudden transition affecting so many people as has occurred in Germany in less than two years. It may be alarming to her neighbours, it *is* alarming, but it undoubtedly has brought a new spirit of confidence and happiness to the German people. Unlike the Italians, they do prefer discipline and they do like uniforms.

It is difficult even today to realize how complete that change has been. Germany today is no longer the defeated power under the Treaty of Versailles. Germany today is a proud people, Germany is a proud nation seeking an opportunity to recover those things of which they believe they were improperly deprived.

Where is it all leading? That great army, that army equipped with weapons of the latest kind is not equipped for defensive purposes. There is no nation that is at all likely to attack Germany. Germany has been deprived of so much that it is inconceivable that any of her neighbours should seek to take more. That army is meant for one purpose. That army is meant for one purpose alone, and the sooner we realize it the better. It is meant for conquest. The answer is to be found, I think, in the Field Marshal's Hall on the Odeon-platz in Munich. Across the end of that hall, which has become a focal point of the sentiment of the German people because there the first Nazis were killed in their march on Munich, are a group of ten names, the names of the States they lost after the war, and above those names are wreaths kept always green, and they will be kept always green until those lost territories are recovered. You don't need to guess. You find in expressed words in the programme of the Nazi Party adopted back in 1920, when the Nazi organization was first created by Hitler, the statement that they must have all those territories back which were stolen from them under the Treaty of Versailles.

Now, don't misunderstand me. I am not holding any brief for Germany. I am not justifying the attitude, I am simply saying what the attitude is. When I say that in the programme of the Nazi Party it is stated they must have these territories back, I say you must realize the almost fanatical belief that the German people have in that programme if you are to understand how important that statement is.

Then here is another thing that must be regarded—the intense hatred of France. In Germany today the hatred of France is almost indescribable and seeing it, one can not help feeling on the slightest excuse this great army would move against France as it moved once before.

I suggest that there is no greater problem of statesmanship before Canada today than to determine what our position is going to be in the face of this threat, because a very real threat it is. I do not suggest and I do not believe that Germany is hostile to the British Empire. I know from conversations I had in Germany this summer that their foreign policy is directed toward establishing British friendship more than toward any other objective they have, but the fact stares us in the face, there is a great army. Only last Monday, General Goering said that the factories of Germany were working 24 hours a day to supply the equipment to those armies to make them all-powerful.

What are we going to do about it? We are not now in the realm of theories. We are in the realm of cold facts, the sort of facts that cost us over 60,000 killed, 160,000 wounded, and figures running in the billions of dollars between 1914 and 1918. It is better that we should make our decision while we can do it dispassionately than wait until the storm breaks. Britain has taken leadership in demanding that Italy recognize those principles of international justice to which she subscribed. I doubt if there was a time when any of us had as much reason to be proud of being British as we have today and I am perfectly sure it is going to fall to Britain's lot and the lot of the British Empire to take the leadership in meeting this extremely efficient and ominous threat that Germany presents today. I do not suggest that war is inevitable, but I do say that war is inevitable unless Germany's intentions are recognized. I do say war is inevitable unless we recognize the fact that Germany intends to have back those properties of which she was deprived. I hold no brief for Germany. There is the fact. If and when Germany demands the return of those properties, what are we going to do? Let us decide while we can make a calm decision. The Treaty of Versailles is dead. Germany has killed it. Britain ratified its death by signing the bilateral navy treaty with Germany last June. If there is no binding treaty it is high time that we met and formed another treaty to take it place. We are at the parting of the ways. Canada must decide what course she is going to take. Are we going to co-operate with the British Empire in seeking a solution or are we going to follow a policy of North American isolation. Those are the two courses before us. If we follow the first we may be committed to serious obligations, very serious obligations indeed. If we follow the latter, we obviously follow the foreign policies of the United States. Those are the only paths which lie before us. There is no use today evading the issue. Personally I hope we throw in our lot with the British Empire. (Applause.) It may involve great risks, but are those risks any greater than if the present armament race goes on until force is used to back demands that could now be discussed under the collective system that in the past few days has for the first time become a living international reality? I think not. Surely the last war gives the answer.

Peace is still possible. Peace can be assured even today, but only if we are prepared to do something to assure that peace. The collective system can work just as our police forces work in our own cities, but peace cannot be assured on the mere expression of pious hopes. Because of our friendly relationship with the United States and because our situation is to some extent similar to theirs, I suggest that if we join the other units of the British Empire in an unqualified support of collective action to enforce peace we would do much to bring together the English-speaking people of the world in an understanding that would do more and will do more than anything else to assure world peace.

(Applause, prolonged)

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, it is going to be very difficult indeed to express adequately to Colonel Drew the appreciation of this gathering for the address to which we have just listened. For that reason, and also because of the real debt that this Club owes to one of the Past Presidents, and due to the fact that he is visiting our City today, I am going to ask Major Baxter to express our thanks to Colonel Drew. (Applause.)

MAJOR BAXTER: Mr President. Colonel Drew, Members: This is a tough assignment and with your permission I will step out of the role of Past President and go into the one which I am better equipped to speak on and that is Advertising.

The ethics, as they call it, of the legal profession and of the physicians, prohibit them from tooting their own horns, so with your permission I will write, if I may, a brief advertisement for Colonel Drew on launching into his legal career.

I think I can first of all deal with him as an authority on international affairs. He has demonstrated today his keen insight, his study, his ability to get beneath the surface and dig up facts.

His next qualification is that in matters of research into the lives and history of those whose political beliefs he may not share, he has demonstrated on more than one occasion how embarrassing he can be to others not so fortunately situated.

The third line of the advertisement is addressed to the ladies of the air. I do not know of any man better equipped to soothe a widow's troubled heart. I would recommend that you place all the affairs of your widows in his hands, though personally, I wouldn't trust my own.

Lastly, summing up, if I may, I would say, Colonel Drew, it is a pleasure to read your writings. It is a pleasure to listen to you and it is even a more lasting pleasure to look at you. We thank you.

(Laughter and applause.)

SOCIAL CREDIT

AN ADDRESS BY MR. C. R. SANDERSON, B.Sc.

Thursday, November 7th, 1935

PRESIDENT BRACE: We have today as our Guest Speaker a gentleman who carries a very definite responsibility to the citizens of this community as the Deputy Chief Librarian of the City of Toronto. He must, of necessity, have considerable to do with the development of thought and opinion of the members of our community. Mr. Sanderson is known to many of you. He is a speaker who is very much in demand. He is a student gifted not only with the ability to study, but also with the ability to select from those studies the important facts; and he is able to pass those on to those with whom he is in touch.

Today our Guest Speaker is going to discuss the subject of Social Credit. No doubt many of you have been studying this subject intensively during the past few months. It is a most interesting subject and we are all interested in learning more of the formula which is going to cure all our ills. After we have heard Mr. Sanderson I am sure our thoughts will have been very definitely broadened on this matter. Mr. Sanderson.

MR. C. R. SANDERSON: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I thank you, Mr. President, for your introduction, not because I flatter myself that I deserve what you say of me, but because it gives me an opening and gives me a chance to explain just where I stand on this topic.

I am not talking politics. I am not discussing any particular application of Social Credit. I am going to try to present to you both sides of the Douglas theory, equally forcibly, equally fairly.

In your public libraries in this city, you have, as you must have, books and material on all sides of all controversial topics. It must be so. A public library is a democratic institution, and if we believe, as we do, in this democracy under which we live, we must believe in the basic principles expressed by James Mill, and John Stuart Mill, and Jeremy Bentham, whereby democracy holds that all sides of a question must be aired in order that in the long run the democracy may, as it will, choose what is right, what is true, and what is just. That is what your Public Library does.

I am not coming to you today then as a politician. I am merely coming to you as in some measure a student of economics, as one who has read more or less widely in that field for a number of years; and I am coming to summarize for you just what you would collect for yourselves if you chose to read on both sides of this particular topic. Actually, Major Douglas' own contributions to the subject are not particularly lucid. He has not the gift of clarity of expression, and it is mainly to his disciples, to his followers, that we have to go for a detailed expression of where he stands.

I therefore proceed to stand on one foot for a few moments and then stand on the other foot. Whilst standing on the one foot I propose to outline as briefly as I can the main principles of this new development called Social Credit; whilst standing on the other foot I propose to submit the opposite case.

Douglas starts with the common argument which we have heard, which we have read, which we ourselves have repeated: that the trouble in the world today is the trouble of under-consumption. There is nothing wrong with the production side. People would buy, nations would buy, you and I would buy, if we had more purchasing power. The trouble, the basic trouble, is under-consumption.

There are all sorts of ideas put forward to cure this ill of under-consumption. Some of the ideas involve a radical reorganisation of society. But Social Credit puts forward a scheme which it believes will cure under-consumption without interfering in any way whatsoever with the present economic organisation. It leaves ownership untouched, it leaves management untouched, it leaves profits untouched, it leaves interest untouched; it leaves the present economic organisation just as it is. It applies itself directly and entirely to the financial side.

Let us set up three preliminary points; and I would beg of the gentlemen in banking and financial circles to bear with me if I state these claims somewhat emphatically.

The first point is: that money need have no particular value in itsef. We know that. Probably you remember reading a brief account in the Year Book of the Toronto Board of Trade, of a certain monetary project in the seventeenth century in this country, in Lower Canada. When actual metallic currency had run out, when no further supply was available, the representative of the French Government hit upon the device of using as currency playing cards which he had endorsed. They were made out for different amounts, a whole card for a large sum, a half card for a lesser sum, a quarter card for a still lesser sum; and these playing cards were in use for nearly thirty-five years, accepted as currency by the people amongst whom they circulated.

Therefore, money need have no particular value in itself. We know, for example, that the old goldsmiths, the originators of banking, accepted gold bullion for safe keeping and issued certificates in return; that those certificates changed hands without the bullion changing hands; and the goldsmiths soon discovered a way—you couldn't blame them—of issuing more tickets than they had actual bullion. Those tickets circulated as currency. So today, to the average man a dollar bill passes as a dollar bill without any particular thought as to the amount of specie there may or may not be at the back of it. As Douglas says, the banking system of today, the financial system of today, is an inverted pyramid of credit standing on an apex of gold. The figures given to me are that in Canada the transactions which are carried out in the form of bills and coin amount only to 2.7% of the total, and that 97.3% of the transactions of this country are carried out in the form of cheque-currency.

If we think of that point, Gentlemen, doesn't the whole currency question take on a different aspect? Doesn't the question of inflation or deflation assume a changed character? It is no longer a dollar bill question; it is a cheque-currency question. So we say, for our first point, that money need have no particular value in itself.

The second point is—and here again I would ask my banking friends to sit quietly: that bank deposits are largely fictitious. They are things that are created in the books of the banks by the loans. The man who goes to the bank and raises a loan of $100,000 immediately creates on the other side of the books of that bank a deposit of $100,000. The fact that he lodges collateral doesn't make one bit of difference. Normally the collateral is merely locked up. But the moment he begins to draw on that deposit (the creation of the bank) in the form of cheque-currency, he immediately adds to the currency of the country. Where does the additional currency come from? It comes from nowhere. It is just new currency added to old currency; it is created by the banks; it is dependent on those deposits which are merely the counterparts of the loans; the whole foundation is a fictitious thing, but it is turning more and more currency into circulation all the time. Go one step further. When the loan is repaid to the bank, as it must be, the bank charges interest, and the bank therefore collects back out of the currency-circulation more than it actually puts in.

If we remember that point, Gentlemen, isn't it perfectly obvious that, as time goes on, under-consumption must be an ever-increasing evil? So much for our second point.

The third point is: that industry today attempts to recover in its prices all the costs of production. But we all know that a constantly increasing proportion of those costs goes to machinery; the relative costs that go to wages are a decreasing proportion of the whole. The result is that the amount which is paid back to the consumer as a return for his labour is never sufficient to buy back the product of industry as it is turned out. In fact the position is worse than that; there is always some saving, and of course we know that every time anybody saves anything this means a reduction of the present consumption-capacity,—a reduction of the demand by the final consumer for goods and services. There is never at any given moment enough purchasing power in the hands of the consumer to buy back the product of industry.

To emphasise this point Douglas here introduces his famous division between what he calls "A" costs and "B" costs. "A" costs in production are the payments made to individuals for salaries, for wages, for dividends. "B" costs are the costs that go for machinery, for maintenance, for raw materials, for financial charges. Actually it is only the "A" costs that are paid back directly to the consumer, that is, the rate of the flow of purchasing power to the individual is represented by "A," because money is normally only distributable through the agency of salaries, wages, and dividends. True, some of the "B" costs go back one way or another to the consumer. Some of the machinery cost, for example, goes back to the consumer. But in point of time it has already gone, perhaps even a considerable time earlier, and spending power distributed, say, two years ago is not available for consumption today. So far as any particular productive period is concerned, practically speaking it is the "A" costs alone that go to the consumer. Yet we expect the consumer with his "A" income to buy back the product of industry, which has cost "A" plus "B" to produce. No wonder we have under-consumption! And no wonder that it has taken on the appearance of being chronic!

That is the situation as Social Credit sees it. And Social Credit proposes to meet it by one piece of basic theory and by two simple applications of that particular theory.

The basic argument is just this: The Financial Credit of a country must be made equal and must be kept equal to its Real Credit. Its Real Credit is its productive capacity. Its Financial Credit is its consuming capacity. These must be made equal and kept equal, and the task of doing it must be a function of the government.

It is stated that apart from all consumable goods and services, $250,000,000 were added to the permanent real credit of this country in 1931. What is needed is that financial credit shall be proportionately increased. If this is done, then the total national consumption can be made equal to the total national production. That is the argument which forms the basic theory of Social Credit.

Of the two applications, the first is this: It is proposed to set up a National Credit Account, or a National Accounting Bureau. This is to be a government commission with a Chairman appointed for life, without political influence in any way whatsoever, having no voice in policy, but having only an actuarial duty to carry out. The actuarial duty is, first, to estimte in terms of money, the real wealth of this country as expressed in its productive capacity. A difficult job? No, not particularly. Why should it be? It is an actuarial job, and if we recall the involved problems which the actuarial profession solves with amazing accuracy, this particular problem does not seem an impossible one. Moreover there are already in existence all sorts of certified balance sheets and other records. Surely an estimate such as is needed is not beyond the powers of skilled actuaries. The real wealth now in existence, having been estimated in this way, is to be made the basis of the issue of financial credit, somewhat after the method which the bank uses when it allows me to create a deposit as the result of a loan. We come back to this in one moment.

Then there is introduced what is called the Just Price. Now, the Just Price is not merely something which means a fair price, or an honest price. The term has a technical meaning. And the Just Price is arrived at in this way: The National Accounting Bureau would actuarially estimate the production costs of industry, and would divide those costs of production under two heads. It would estimate separately the *real* costs of production, i.e., the wear and tear, use of raw materials, and the living costs of those who are employed in production and of their dependents. These real costs of production are represented by everything which is consumed in order to make production possible—the wastage, so to speak, that takes place in a productive period.

Then there are in addition all the other costs which, together with these real costs, go to make up the total cost which is the financial cost.

Supposing then that the financial cost is represented by 100, and supposing the real cost is actuarially found to be 75, then the Just Price for the succeeding period would be announced as 75. And immediately all things would sell at retail for 75 per cent of their previous prices.

A retailer is, of course, 25 per cent out of pocket. He sends his sales-vouchers to the bank. The bank scrutinises them and then gives him credit for the missing 25 per cent, and the banks reclaim this amount from the National Credit Account. The additional purchasing power, i.e., the additional financial credit, is issued from the National Credit Account on the basis (or security) of the estimated real wealth that the country possesses. It is called the National Discount.

But, you say, where is the money to come from? Wait a moment. Don't let us get a conception of dollar bills. Let us remember that 97.3% of our present transactions are cheque transactions, not dollar bill transactions. We saw earlier that with this conception in mind the currency question assumed a new aspect. It was no longer a dollar bill question; it was a cheque-currency question. And the authority which is exercised as the basis for this additional cheque-currency is of the same nature as the authority a bank exercises for additional cheque-currency when it advances a loan and thereby creates a deposit. But behind the authority of the National Credit Account is the real wealth of the country.

You say that is just inflation under another cover. Oh no! Inflation as we know it is inseparable from rising prices. Inflation operates when we add to existing money whilst goods remain fixed in amount; prices and not purchasing power then rise. But this thing doesn't even begin to operate until prices have come down, because it is only the difference between the new lower price (the Just Price) and the old higher price that is made up in this financial credit which is issued from the National Credit Account. Inflation is an increase of currency without any corresponding increase in production; prices must inherently be higher. But the kernel of Social Credit is the increased production that will immediately accompany the issue of the increased credit. To this we come in just one moment.

You say the prices won't come down. They cannot help but come down. We haven't interfered with competition. The big department stores will still be competing with one another. The independent trader is still competing with his old competitors and with the department stores. The manufacturers of motor cars are still competing, one with another. Of course prices will come down, by the amount of the National Discount for the period. Competition will see to this.

The Just Price is therefore a reduced price; the margin between that price and the old price is made up by a National Discount. Obviously the immediate result would be an enormously increased consumption-capacity. We should have an immediate and sustained increase in demand, and we should have given a wonderful stimulus to production.

Let us go on to the second application of the basic theory. The second application is the creation of what is called a National Dividend. Everybody in the country is regarded as a shareholder in Canada, Incorporated. We are those shareholders. We are the successors in a big national inheritance, not merely on the cultural side but also on the real wealth side. And by regarding as the basis for financial credit one trivial section of that real wealth of the country, there can be paid to every man, woman, and child, a National Dividend. One figure that has been suggested is $200 a year; another figure that has been suggested is $300; and this Dividend is payable to every man, woman, and child, as a shareholder in Canada, Incorporated. The authority for the issue of this additional financial credit (representing increased purchasing power) is exactly the same as in the case of the National Discount already discussed. The amount may be a small amount, but let us remember that it goes to every individual. It is a kind of old age pension payable from birth. And let us remember that its actual purchasing power is increased by the Just Price and the National Discount which is already operative. The result is that this National Dividend would again increase consumption and stimulate production.

Look at it as compared with a national unemployment insurance scheme. It is claimed—I don't believe very justly, but it is claimed—that a national insurance scheme is an encouragement to people not to work, because the man pays out so long as he is employed, and draws from the scheme only when he is not working. Actually, I do not believe there is very much in the argument. I have followed the results in the Old Country fairly closely and the abuses are relatively trivial. But if there is any encouragement against work by a national insurance scheme, there can be no such drawback in the case of the National Dividend. The individual gets the Dividend whether he is employed or not, and there is actually a stimulus to work rather than any possible discouragement. You say there would still be wasters. Yes, there would still be wasters. But remember the increased consumption and the stimulated production we have just discussed. There would be work for anyone who was able to work. If a man is able but not willing to work, he becomes a national charge. And if he becomes a national charge *he is kept out of his own National Dividend,* with the result that all the terrific load of taxation which is now going to the relief of unemployment is lifted at once.

The query as to where all this money is coming from has already been met, I think, in what we have said. The answer is practically the same as the answer to the query: where does the deposit come from when the bank creates one by making a loan, It is *created* in the same way, but in the case of Social Credit the creation is by the government, and the sanction behind creation is the Real Wealth of the country.

But you may ask where is it ultimately going to? It is going from consumer to producer; it is coming back from producer to consumer. It is stimulating consumption; it is at the same time stimulating production. "Oh yes," you may interrupt, "but what about withdrawing it?" Social Credit asks in return: "Why does it have to be withdrawn at all?" The only reason why it would have to be withdrawn, the only possible circumstance under which we need even trouble ourselves so far as withdrawal is concerned, would be when the total national consumption would have caught up to total national production. The particular scale of financial credit that is issued under the National Discount is only issued for a fixed period. Three months is suggested. The scale of Discount is revised at the end of the period and announced for the next period. If prices are rising, if consumption is catching up to production, the national discount shortens from say 25 to 20, to 15, to 10, to 5. It may disappear altogether. In fact it may be replaced by a sales tax. Gentlemen, the only reason why that could happen would be because total national consumption would have caught up to total national production. And in our wildest dreams of economic recovery, in our wildest dreams of returning prosperity, have we ever imagined anything more wonderful than that—that total national consumption would have equalled total national production?

Whether that is achieved or not, it is the direction in which we should then be moving. As the result of the National Discount plus the National Dividend there must inevitably be a stimulated consumption; this in turn showing itself in a stimulated production; increased production again meaning cheaper production; and cheaper production again in turn further stimulating production. The final result is the whole of industry starting on a new wheel, a new circle, a new cycle of restored and continued prosperity.

Now that, Gentlemen, is, very badly, an outline of what Social Credit proposes and, watching the time at my disposal, I cannot spend any further time on that side of our topic. But one thing you will ask is what becomes of the banks. Nothing becomes of the banks. The banks stay as they are, except that they lose their credit making function. That becomes a government function. Otherwise, the banks operate just as now. They take care of our savings, when we have any, and under such prosperous conditions savings would increase. They would lend the money out at interest and there would be much more to lend. But they would lend only actual deposits and would not create the deposits. Otherwise, the banks are the agency through which the scheme would operate. Nothing happens to the banks except perhaps an increase of work.

Let me now turn and stand on the other foot for a moment or two. Criticisms ofthe Social Credit scheme will have occurred to your mind as I have been talking. Let me put my finger on one or two of them. You know, as I know, that bank deposits and bank loans are not something that go on in ever-increasing quantity. Normally, they are constant, or roughly constant. Certainly the banks do not go on continually and all the time creating new currency which is added to old, because cancellations are constantly taking place. New loans largely replace old loans.

Major Douglas quotes Mr. Reginald McKenna, the chairman of the Midland Bank, as having said: "Every bank loan and every purchase of securities by a bank creates a deposit." But a few hundred words further on McKenna proceeded to say: "While banks have this power of creating money they exercise it only within the strict limits of sound banking policy. Anyone who studies the monthly statements of the London Clearing Banks will see that these banks keep a reserve of cash fairly constant in relation to the amount of their deposits. Thus a limit is placed on a bank's power of lending by the amount of its cash and, so long as the canons of conservative banking are conformed to, additional loans can only be made if the cash is increased. Banks lend or invest up to the full amount permitted by their cash resources, but they do not go beyond that point." This is a very different picture from that which Douglas presents either by his own statement or by his quotation from McKenna. It is perfectly true that in times of depression the banks curtail their credit facilities. It may even be true, and probably is true, that the moment a little cloud of depression comes over the horizon, the bank puts up its umbrella before the storm starts. Isn't that conservatism just the thing that has kept our credit system stable? Security does not permit the taking of risks. Those of us who have friends over the border know not merely with what anxiety, but with what deep-seated disturbance, society is rocked when the credit security of a country is threatened in times of depression.

It is perfectly true also that in times of prosperity the banks expand their credit facilities. Indeed it probably is true that the accepted banking policy does actually increase the trend at any particular moment, by contract-ing its credit facilities or by extending them, the first in times of depression and the second in times of prosperity. But it is not true that in normal times, or at any times, the banks go on and on, adding new currency to old. There seems to be a fallacy in the Social Credit argument that deposits are in reality ficitious. And it is not correct to say that, in the final analysis, industry is financed by bank deposits. In the long run it is financed by individual savings, or, as is often the case by individual losses.

Then it seems to me that there is a possible fallacy in the argument (at any rate in the form in which it is stated) about the insufficiency of consuming power in the possession of the consumer that there is never enough purchasing power in the possession of the consumer to buy back the product of industry.

Even accepting the statement that money is normally only distributable through the agency of salaries, wages, and dividends, the Douglas argument tends to suggest that the only money so distributed is through the producer of the final consumer's commodity. But similar payments are all the time being made by the manufacturers of producer's commodities; that is, for example, by the people responsible for the erection of buildings, the making of machinery; by the producers of raw materials; even by those who provide the very credit facility itself. The product in these cases is not intended to go directly to the final consumer, yet those responsible for the production are distributing purchasing power (in the form of salaries, wages, and dividends) to the final consumer. Much more purchasing power is flowing directly to the final consumer than the Douglas argument suggests. And all these operations are going on at the same time; while the boot store is selling one consignment of boots, the tanner is producing hides for more.

Again, in the same connection I want rather emphatically to draw attention to one thing so generally accepted that we tend to forget it. That is consumer's credit. It plays an enormous part in industry today. A man can buy a house and hold it on a mortgage. He hasn't paid for it. He can buy a motor car and pay for it on instalment. He can buy a radio, or a washing machine, or he can even furnish his house in the same way. Every time he does anything of this kind he is using consumer's credit, because he hasn't paid for the commodity he is enjoying. He goes to his doctor or to his dentist, and it may be that his doctor or his dentist does not render his account for six months. Maybe the man doesn't pay the account for another six months. He is to that extent living on consumer's credit. And it may be argued that, so far from never being in possession of enough purchasig power to buy back the product of industry at any given time, the consumer is actually in possession of a very, very large number of goods and services long before he has paid for them. Indeed we can go further and say that he hasn't even begun to do the work necessary to earn the salary or wages which will ultimately pay for those goods and services. There certainly seems to be a fallacy somewhere in that argument about the insufficiency of purchasing power in the possession of a consumer to buy back the product of industry.

Then let us look for a moment at the finance of the scheme. That suggestion of 75 per cent for a Just Price was a very conservative suggestion. I have seen 60 per cent suggested. I have seen even 40 per cent suggested. The figure is highly hypothetical. Leave that National Discount at one side for a moment, and look first at the National Dividend which will give every man, woman, and child, say $300 a year. At a rough estimate that means 3 billion dollars a year in this country. Imagine the total as years go by. Then what kind of a figure are we going to add to this as a total represented by the National Discount? A sum very, very much larger, even on the most conservative basis. This represents a tremendous quantity of additional purchasing power if we take a number of years and add the annual totals together. It is all right to say that whatever the amount may be it doesn't matter; it is all right to say that it merely represents purchasing power going from consumer to producer, back to consumer, and back to producer again. That sounds plausible enough, but one thing seems to me to be involved which is a fundamental in the whole problem; it is a fundamental which has never yet been disproved; it is the fact that the quantity of a thing which is in existence is an inseparable factor in the value of the unit. And though it may be true that this additional purchasing power created by Social Credit may not appear in huge quantities of additional dollar bills, in the last resort the purchasing power must be fluid. It must be easily transferable. It must be measurable by the unit. What is the unit? What can the unit be? We may not have cart-loads of dollar bills, but we come down to the dollar bill as the unit measure. We know that if the banks substantially extend their credit facilities that means rising prices, because we know the unit falls in value. So with this enormous issue of additional purchasing power that same fundamental must still apply: the quantity of a thing is an inseparable factor in the value of the unit. That law applies to radium, it applies to diamonds, it applies to gold, it applies to dollar bills, it applies to anything in this world. That fundamental seems to me to be rather left out of the Social Credit argument, and whatever temporary lowering effect on prices the National Discount may produce, in the long run and as the value of the purchasing unit falls, prices must inevitably rise.

I have just time for one more point and only one. The real wealth of the country is to be made the basis for the issue of further financial credit, of further purchasing power. But, Gentlemen, can we put our finger on one bit of real wealth, either in this country or any other country, to which there is not already a ticket fastened indicating possession?

A friend of mine, who is the General Manager of one of the large insurance companies in England, came over here three or four years ago to find an avenue for investment funds. I had known him well in the Old Country and he came to see me within a few hours of his reaching Toronto. Almost his first question to me was: "Are there other cities in Canada with big buildings like Toronto?" "Oh, yes." "And what is your population?" "Oh, about ten millions." "Well, don't you know that you are over capitalised?" I said, "Why?" He said, "Well, I came to the Union Station—a beautiful station, a magnificent station. I come out of it and I face a beautiful and magnificent hotel. I look around and I see skyscrapers, enormous buildings. Those are apparently repeated, even if not to the same extent, in other parts of the country. For your population you are over capitalised."

He may be right or he may not. I am not expressing any opinion. But in all that wealth can we put our finger on one spot that is not already tagged with an ownership ticket, and, if he is right, possibly with a financial ownership ticket that is beyond the real value, We know there are ticket tags on the railways. We know the municipalities in many cases are mortgaged up to the hilt. We know the extent of watered stock. Where is the real wealth to which a ticket of possession is not already attached? How then can we capitalise this wealth again in order to create financial credit when the full, perhaps over-full, measure of financial credit justified by that real wealth is already in existence?

So my last comment is this: We have a credit system now which, perfectly or imperfectly, does work. It is backed by a banking system which, perfectly or imperfectly, does work. If we scrap that system which does work, whether imperfectly or otherwise, and if we substitute a hypothetical system which *may* work, but which may not work, what then will happen supposing the hypothetical system doesn't work, when we have already scrapped the system that does work? In that event, the result could be expressed only in terms of economic disaster.

Now, Gentlemen, I come back on both feet and stand on both at once as impartially as I can. I have tried to present to you the bare bones of both sides of the case in the time that I have had at my disposal. You have had extraordinary patience with me. *My* eyes have constantly flickered over the whole of this big audience. I have been conscious that *your* eyes have been meeting mine, giving me a sustained attention for which I am grateful. I thank you very, very sincerely for your patience in a talk that has been somewhat hard slugging.

But there are the two sides. You pay your money, you take your choice. You can go on the swings if you like. If you don't like the swings, take the roundabouts.

(Hearty Applause.)

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, the same remark was passing through my mind as I listened to Mr. Sanderson. You pay your money and you take your choice. We can proceed with eyes front. We can divert to a Social Credit plan or we can take a ninety degree turn to the left. We are going to pay our money in any event. We and our children and our children's children will pay for what we have been going through during this past five years and I think we should recognise our responsibility at this time and in the future in planning the course of this country so that for ourselves, for our children, we may find the best future that is possible.

I would like to add just one thing to the later remarks of our guest speaker. I would like to quote an excerpt from a very much discussed address made by Sir Edward Beatty in London recently, in which he said: "The business life of this country as I know it is carried on by thousands and hundreds of thousands of men and women, each doing his and her best, usually in all honesty and decency, to obtain a reasonable reward for what he can accomplish. I admit its clumsiness, I admit its perversion by individuals of less than average moral principle, I admit its periodical inefficiency. Against all these, I place the single fact that the system as we have it has for a thousand years or more of recorded history raised the living standard of the whole human race and has steadily removed and not accentuated the inequalities which a thousand years ago separated class from class."

I wish to express, Gentlemen, on your behalf, to Mr. Sanderson our very deep appreciation for this most illuminating address. (Applause.)

BRITAIN'S NEW RESPONSIBILITIES

AN ADDRESS BY MRS. JOHN F. DAVIDSON, M.A.

Thursday, November 14th, 1935

PRESIDENT: Ladies and Gentlemen: Today we are indeed very pleased to have once more a Ladies' Day. It has always been a popular day with us and, as I recollect, we have one or two such occasions in each of our seasons. When our guest speaker was advised that there would be ladies present she said the ladies would be able to give her some moral support. My understanding is that our guest speaker needs no support of any nature. She is a student of the first rank and has had a very distinguished career in public speaking. One would not use the phrase that Mrs. Davidson is popular with the ladies. One would say that the ladies are all extremely proud of Mrs. Davidson. There are very few men in this organization or elsewhere in the city who have not had confirmed at their dining room table many of the glowing things the ladies are saying about Mrs. Davidson.

As many of you know, Mr. Davidson is a Master in Upper Canada College and I understand, and I have it on good authority, that Mrs. Davidson is proud of four things. She is proud of her Canadian husband. She is proud of her two Canadian children, and she is proud of her own Canadian citizenship.

Mrs. Davidson will address us today on the subject: "Britain's New Responsibilities." I have very much pleasure in calling on Mrs. Davidson. (Applause.)

MRS. JOHN F. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairiman, Ladies and Gentlemen: My pride at having achieved the honour of addressing this distinguished men's club is only pricked by two facts and my awareness of those facts. The first is, that I happen to be a woman and so my remarks, perhaps, will not be as appreciated as they might be otherwise.

To illustrate the point, I want to tell a little story of what happened to me. When I was invited I told my little girl, aged six, that her mother was going to address a very large body of men. She said, "Mummy, I would not like to be you." Then she said, continuing this process of thought, "When I grow up, will I also have to speak to all those men?" I said, "I do not know."

Thus our difficulties of understanding one another, of pleasing one another, begin rather early and we are apprehensive about the point of view which we entertain. We are not quite free in our relationships. Yet it seems to me that in the future the solution of the vast body of problems which we will have to deal with are going to be arrived at only in measure as we realize the richness and varieties of opinion which exist in this world, and a large part of these solutions will no doubt be due to women's participation in it.

The second fact is that of actually daring to speak on a subject which is extremely close to you all, because you have been born into British circumstances. I, on the other hand, belong to the category known vaguely as foreigners and am only a citizen of the British Commonwealth of Nations by adoption.

I am extremely proud that the heritage of my children is cast among these circumstances and I could, perhaps, single out no other land which will give them as many opportunities as this.

On the other hand, I would like to say that perhaps my environment and the early environment which I had qualifies me to be a person to bring in that necessary, as it were, understanding among nations which will bring about that higher level of international relations. My early environment, as you know, was spent in a country most autocratically governed (I mean by that, Russia) though I was fortunate to be in a milieu in which four nations mixed freely and the English were one aspect of that milieu. I grew up to an early admiration, which came to me from my parents, of English people, the freedom manifest in their actions, their ability to rise to a higher moral understanding of other nations; these things charmed me at a very early age.

Later on in my university career which I was fortunate to have also in an Anglo-Saxon country, I was much impressed with the advanced nature of the political institutions, with the essential freedom so necessary in our modern world, and precepts and qualities which could be adopted by wider groups of nations all over the world.

With these remarks and with these two qualifying statements, I assure you I appreciate being here before you today and I am extremely grateful to you for the invitation to speak on the subject which is, "Britain's New Responsibilities."

I like to point out that at the very centre of Britain's new responsibilities, at the core of it is the aspect which is peace. Stanley Baldwin, Britain's Prime Minster, said this on the occasion of his recent broadcast which was a pre-election speech. (You all know the elections in Britain are taking place today.) He said that what Britain wants and what she longs for is peace, not only peace in England but peace in Europe and not only peace in Europe but peace throughout the world.

With this thought in mind, if we recapitulate the early happenings in the Spring, we notice that there was intensified activity in Britain, members of the Foreign Staff being despatched to many capitals of Europe, the obvious thing to do when the European nations were coming to a difficult impasse. And so the British representatives Sir John Simon and Anthony Eden were trying to alleviate the situation.

It is also interesting to remember that after the Jubilee celebrations came to a close in the British Government, for the first time in British History, the League of Nations was given a prominent place and a new cabinet post was organized, that of the Minister for League of Nations Affairs which was entrusted, as you know, to Captain Anthony Eden, the Right Honourable Robert Anthony Eden.

It was quite true that the British Government had obtained the expression of 12,000,000 Britishers of voting age, on five important aspects of foreign policy which, as you know, was brought forward by Lord Cecil, that tireless worker for world peace, and the first item of this peace ballot contained the question of Britain's membership in the League of Nations.

With this in mind I feel that work performed in the sphere of foreign relations by the visits of Britain's representatives to foreign capitals, by the fact that there have been Britishers, a vast constituency of twelve millions, who expressed their opinion on foreign policy, and also, by sounding a distinct note in the British Government by creating a new post of the Minister of League of Nations Affairs, that all these combined give us a sense of a new statesmanship perhaps not as well known in the past years as it is today, a statesmanship which recognizes that there is a vast power in the British Empire which has a definite responsibility in leading the world at this crucial period of world history. That she has undertaken this position of leadership there is no doubt and the expressions of her men of import, whether it be the Prime Minister or the Minister of Foreign Affairs or the Minister of the League of Nations Affairs, or even the group which formerly was not a great believer in the League of Nations, headed by Winston Churchill, all of these groups combined show that Britain is trying to make out of the League with its collective principle, a real world reality.

There are concepts which would make incomplete a historical resume which would not include the opposite side. By this I mean the resume which does not include many exceedingly conclusive views and which are omnipresent in the foreign press, for example in the French press, in the Italian press and in the Austrian press, so much so that the British representatives have actually had to make objections.

These concepts include the following: The concept that Great Britain's action toward the League and toward, as it were, imposing herself upon the world in the sphere of leadership is actuated by motives which are neither sincere nor honourable.

For instance, such an analysis would include the summary of such points as that Britain is interested in making the League effective at present because there is a definite imperial aspect, that her artery to the East, particularly to India, is being interefered with; then there is the aspect which is challenging Britain's hegemony in the Mediterranean; and another aspect that Britain cannot relinquish her vast possessions and holdings in the African colonies. There is another point of view that British labour is pushing the government to action against Italy because they abhor Fascism. This fact also, that the world is getting back into a position where rearmament is right and that Britain is acting at present because she is fearing the Germany of tomorrow, that she is acting the way she is today because she is fearing for her world wide Empire. Another thing frankly mentioned is that she fears European complications.

Now, in an analysis of Britain's responsibilities a historical account would be incorrect if you did not mention these aspects. But even if we consider these aspects and to them might be added many more, nevertheless it remains true and it is indubitable that Britain's primary concern today is peace. (Applause). It is true and one could reiterate the thought because it was so extremely well expressed in the speech on Foreign Affairs by Sir Samuel Hoare on the occasion of the opening of the British Parliament on October 22nd, who said: "The natural concern of a world wide Empire is the concern for peace of a world wide nature."

If you think of this central aspect to British foreign policy and the new responsibility that she has taken up in connection with this you no doubt can see that from this particular point of view have always emanated actions; for instance, the interesting relationship of Great Britain with France, the almost pushing nature which these relationships have had, the requirement on the part of Britain from France of a clear statement of just exactly where she stands with regard to the League, the fact that they have an understanding now after many difficulties. The Prime Minister of France, Pierre Laval, has after all had to say that when he analyzes the well being of France, that it is to France's great advantage to follow the lead of Great Britain which is that of supporting the collective principle against a nation which has transgressed and that nation is Italy.

If you consider such interesting aspects as for instance Britain's interests and her continued reiteration of her need of Empire assistance, there are many people who are not quite sure whether Britain's point of view expresses the point of view of her Dominions or of the members of that vast and far-flung Empire, known to the more modern students of history as the British Commonwealth of Nations. It is true, as Sir Samuel Hoare said, that in Britain's leadership at the League, the one thing that helped them to maintain that almost undaunted and courageous support of the collective principle has been the fact that the Dominions, without exception, have expressed themselves for the policy that Great Britain has adopted at the League. This particular policy has been fortified by the expressions of our government representative at the League, in the sphere of sanctions, (that important, untried method of bringing the nation that has sinned to the understanding that she cannot plunge any more a world that is ours into such a thing as a war.)

Therefore, the British support of the League, long awaited, long hoped for, particularly Britain's support of the collective principle, has been of such immense importance these days. It has been cheering, has been leading one to hope that this interest of Great Britain in the present difficulty has been so great and so powerful that she has been forced from the depth of her national being to go out to the League of Nations with the hope it will become a principle of reality in the world. We must say, if we are correct students of history that the selfish motive, if you please and want to call it that, has been so important, has been so vital, that it has compelled Great Britain to act the way she has acted and that when it has been blended with the aspect of ideals which any collective principle has in our day, that it, as it were, brings up the level of international morality to a higher standard and whatever the basis, even if selfish, even if the natural concern for an Empire, even if the concern for a peace necessary for the Empire, the thing yet remains true, it has blended with idealism and it has led to a more hopeful, as it were, international behaviour. (Applause.)

However, in all the ideals and all the high level of international leadership that Great Britain has manifest we could look for no signs of betterment in this world had it not been for the obvious thing that eventually, sooner or later, the world will have to tackle, the problem we haven't tackled, that is go to the basic causes which lead to war.

Now, you all know we live in a world of economic difficulty, that we have difficult and cumbersome and unpleasant trade policies, that the financial condition, from the point of view of stabilized currency, is rather precarious in the world. You all know it is extremely difficult for some nations to find markets. Consequently, the world has been plunged into that undesirable economic behaviour known as economic nationalism, the tightening of trade barriers, the institution of tariffs, the institution of quotas, bonuses, subsidies and so forth.

In other words, the sum total position, such an economic position of the world leads to political tensions and, consequently, not until the world tackles these basic causes of the difficulty will we be able to say that war will never again come within the orbit of our experience.

Now, Great Britain has not neglected the lead in that sphere, either. Sir Samuel Hoare's utterances at Geneva at the extraordinary session of the Council, later taken up in his speech I mentioned at the opening of Parliament on October 22nd was this, that Britain recognizes the natural grievances of some nations and to those grievances belong the grievances of Italy, that these have to be attended to, so the League becomes not only an instrument for preventing war but the League becomes also an instrument for comprehensive economic world justice, and Sir Samuel Hoare in no uncertain terms divided the world into two groups:—Nations which have, as he calls it, "the haves" and the nations which have not, "the have-nots." He said, that in any future condition of the world, these causes will have to be attended to. Italy will have to be given greater access to raw materials. It will be necessary to institute a freer flow of raw materials. The question of population will have to be considered. The question of colonial reappropriation will have to be considered.

The question, however, which he saw most clearly was the need of financial stability in the world. In other words, what the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Great Britain has said in no uncertain terms is that the League is not only a group of nations which are trying to prevent the other group of nations from expressing itself but that the League of Nations is this instrument that it is supposed to be, an instrument of international justice, comprehensive international justice and to that end British energies will be devoted to make it a reality.

It seems to me I could do no better than end with paraphrasing other aspects or thoughts of Sir Samuel Hoare, Britain's Foreign Minister who speaks better for that country than any other man because he has his finger tips on the situation. His work at Geneva is so energy-and-courage-demanding that we appreciate all the marvellous things he said there. To begin with I would like to say this, that when he spoke of the League and of Great Britain, he said that Great Britain couldn't help but play an important role in the conditions of today. The same thing was said in almost similar terms by Stanley Baldwin at the Conference on October 25th. This thought has been amplified by his saying, that Great Britain feels and no doubt knows that she is destined to lead Europe, that she cannot help but lead her and at this moment she is a bridge between Europe and the new world and from that point of view I appreciate very much the remarks of Sir Samuel Hoare on isolationists. It is a policy or rather a mode of mind that we sometimes tend to cultivate, to become isolationists, to withdraw from the world's troubles, and not to be within the orbit of these difficulties. It is almost natural and Sir Samuel Hoare said so. He said, "The temptation of withdrawing from the scene of difficulty has been greater than I can tell you, but I tell you, those people who believe that isolationism is possible in our day with the industrial civilization we have evolved, are people who are living in a sphere of dismal illusion, because they obviously are not understanding the nature of this universe which we are inhabiting. Therefore, though it does seem to us natural to become isolated, to desire to institute, perhaps, policies and trends of thought which make us isolated, we must remember that with our perfectly marvellous endowments which we have and the magnificent heritage which we have and also the qualifications which we possess through our greatness in playing a role of leadership in the world, it would be hardly fair to that heritage to withdraw at the moment of such danger for the world and that Great Britain from that point of view has undoubtedly played her role in the traditional manner of high honour and valour, and at this crucial moment of the world history she has undertaken the cross of new responsibility.

Stanley Baldwin said in his speech, broadcast on October 25th, that in this role of responsibility there are great risks and dangers. Of this Great Britain is fully aware, but for the sake of a new order in international relations—of which it is almost a question of 'now or never'—she is willing to undertake this role and play her part valiantly and in this we could do no better than to stand closely behind Great Britain and see to it that our heritage is not spoiled by our fleeing our responsibilities. (Hearty applause.)

President: I am sure that round the dining room tables of at least two hundred homes there will be no further necessity for the ladies to try to persuade that one of their sex is an outstanding student and an outstanding public speaker.

I trust that Mrs. Davidson will go home to her little daughter and tell her it was not too difficult to speak to an audience such as this, that she probably could have done just as well even though the ladies had not been present.

I know from looking around the room the intense interest with which all of us who have been here have followed the words of Mrs. Davidson. As a Canadian citizen who was not born in Canada, we should be very proud of her, indeed, and we can only hope that we could have thousands of other citizens of her calibre.

Mrs. Davidson, may I on behalf of this group extend to you our very sincere appreciation for this address. (Applause.)

THE NEW ALIGNMENTS IN EUROPE

AN ADDRESS BY MR. HARRISON BROWN

Thursday, November 21st, 1935

In the absence of the President, Mr. J. H. Brace, the Chair was occupied by the Vice-President, Mr. H. C. Bourlier.

MR. BOURLIER: Gentlemen of the Empire Club: Your Executive takes much pleasure today in presenting to you a gentleman who by reason of his many accomplishments has attained a high position in the field of journalism and on the public lecture platform, both in Great Britain and the United States. Mr. Harrison Brown enlisted in the British army in the year 1914, and some years after the War occupied the position of European representative of the American Committee for the Outlawing of War, in which connection he was in constant attendance at Geneva. He has also engaged in radio lectures for the British Broadcasting Corporation and it is a matter of interest to note that he made the last uncensored political broadcast in Berlin. His residence on the Continent has enabled him to make a very close study of the political situation there and it is in that connection he is to address us today, his subject being, "The New Alignments in Europe." I have pleasure in introducing Mr. Harrison Brown.

MR. HARRISON BROWN: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: I am a wanderer on the face of the earth, with precious little other qualification to address such an audience as this, but if constant travelling does teach you anything, then possibly I am in a position to say something about the present tensions in Europe since I have been travelling over and over that ground practically since the War.

One of the chief factors in my opinion in European politics today is the attempt on the part of the present government in Germany to form a Fascist bloc which the Nazis hope shall stretch from the North Sea to the Bosphorus. I am not going to prophesy, Gentlemen. I don't know much but I do know the utter futility of prophecy about European policies. No doubt all you gentlemen here have followed and do follow international affairs. If you think back over the last four or five years and imagine that at any given period in that time you had had a vision and had known what were going to be the chief happenings the following six months and supposing you had published or broadcast these, you will agree, I think, you would be denounced as one of the worst sort of alarmists. So I have felt at any time even to mention the most major changes of the next few months was dangerous.

To illustrate how enormously what they call the atmosphere has changed, I remember very, very vividly, less than ten years ago, one afternoon in Geneva. It was at the time that Briand followed Stresemann at the Tribune of the League of Nations. Stresemann had impressed most of us with the emotion and sincerity with which he had given thanks for their having reached that particular stage in the process of Franco-German reconciliation. Stresemann did a great job. He had no particular platform manner, nevertheless he had got across enormously that day. Then Briand followed. It was probably one of the greatest days of his career and probably the most hard-boiled among us were thrilled with that speech, as he addressed himself to the mothers of Europe, telling them that now the hatchet was buried, they could sleep in peace. There would be no more war between France and Germany.

All that seems a long time ago. It is not so long since Mr. Stanley Baldwin was telling us that if the Disarmament Conference failed, then Europe would be face to face with the suicide of civilization. It did fail.

It is still less time since Stanley Baldwin said in the

House of Commons, and you probably heard about it here, "I have been rendered physically sick these past weeks to think that I and my friends, statesmen in every nation are spending their time thinking how they can take the mangled bodies of little children to hospitals and save men and women from being choked to death by gas."

Today, an armament race is in full progress and a permanent member of the League Council is committing, perhaps, one of the very few open, blatant acts of aggression in history.

In such a state as that, obviously any attempt to discuss the present tension in the shape of alignments must be in the shape of an interim report. The post-war division of Europe has changed and is changing to a degree only comparable to the change of the atmosphere to which I have just referred. There is no longer that clear cut division between the pro-status quo group of nations and the anti-status quo, which was the predominant feature of the political map of Europe during the twelve post-war years. It is only necessary to remember very, very exactly the present setup to see how things have changed. Russia, for instance, after being an Ishmaelite among the nations, her hand against every man's and every man's hand against hers, Russia today is the ally of France, the near-ally of Czechoslovakia and Roumania. Italy, after officially at least being somewhat pro-British for years, is now obviously almost violently anti-British, while her attitude toward France has changed almost to the same extent in the opposite direction. Little Austria, in size of no importance at all, in geographical position predominant in importance, Austria is a vassal of Italy, almost, one might say, a vassal of Mussolini. Hungary, in the shape of her Premier, Julius De Gombos, is the chosen intermediary of Nazi Germany for its diplomatic manoeuvres in Central Europe. Strangest metamorphosis of all, Poland, so long the king pin of the status quo group is now, superficially, at least, deserting the status quo group and throwing in her lot with her age long enemy, Germany, in all this business is working over time to form an anti-French bloc.

Now, I want, as briefly as I can, to get to a point where we can assess the importance of this present German attempt to form a Fascist bloc across the Continent and perhaps we can form some sort of opinion as to whether it will succeed and what the effect if it succeeds or fails is likely to be.

I will have to go back a little bit and I will be as quick as I can on that point. I am of those who have always considered that the Versailles Treaty was a deplorable piece of business. There is, however, some case to be made for those who say it is the best that could be done at the time. There is in my opinion, no case to be made out for the post-war diplomatic policy, either of Great Britain or France, for a considerable period of years after the Versailles Treaty. In other words, I believe we might with advantage have dictated to Germany in the early days after the Versailles Treaty. I do not think that we had any excuse whatever for the policy of pin-prick humiliation which we followed. That policy was inexcusable. The result is what we see today—Nazidom, and a barbarian Germany.

I remember at the Hague Conference in 1929, Stresemann in so many words prophesied to me the present developments. He said, briefly, after a long talk, "Unless your people give me something to take home to my people to convince them that my policy is getting somewhere, you will before long have an ultra-nationalist, intractable Germany which neither you nor I nor anybody else will be able to deal with." That is precisely what happened.

I lived for a considerable period of years in both France and Germany. I think I can say with pretty intimate knowledge of both peoples that it was possible for at least ten years after the Treaty of Versailles, or probably longer, it was possible to form a true reconciliation between those nations and thereby make a true foundation for peace in Europe. I very much fear that now the last opportunity may have been lost. That is not a prophecy. I say I very much fear it may have been lost.

A few weeks ago I was wandering about Central Europe, in Prague, Vienna, Budapest, little towns in central districts, talking to everybody I met. I came back with two main impressions. One, that of the absolute fatalism of the informed opinion in those countries —by informed opinion I mean the opinion of those people whom I had known long enough for them to talk intimately to me in legations, in foreign offices and editorial rooms—in contrast to that which I can only call the absolute innocence of the uninformed masses, in this sense. If you venture to give them a simple analysis tending to show the possibility of war, the reaction, particularly among the middle classes, was inevitably one of incredulity as well as horror.

In the present setup, Nazi Germany is without any doubt at all the most dynamic force. The fact that Nazi Germany exists today is, in my opinion, an indictment of European statesmanship in the immediate post-war years, particularly. I had hoped and I still venture to hope that Anthony Eden may do something to redress it all. That we have yet to see. It is by no means certain that Anthony Eden will be returned to the Foreign Office, though if he is not returned there is no doubt his removal from there will be distinctly unpopular with the country. I think one can say that without fear of exaggeration. After all, there is a pretty definite feeling in Great Britain that the discrepancy of the advanced age of the Cabinet is too pronounced and after all, Eden is the one outstanding figure of British politics belonging to the war generation.

My opinion is that definitely Germany is launched on an expansionist policy which is extremely likely to lead to war. Somebody once said and there is a good deal of truth in it, though the generalization is obviously not a hundred per cent true, somebody said, the Germans, as a whole, as a nation understand inferiority, they understand superiority; they do not understand equality. You will find practically everybody who is at all interested in international affairs in Europe will have an opinion on this expansionist policy and nearly all of them will agree that that is so, that they are launched on an expansionist policy. The controversy only comes as to whether it is temporary or otherwise. In relation to that, latterly there has been a good deal of publicity about the so-called demand for colonies on the part of Germany and in some quarters to say, "For Heaven's sake, let us settle the matter. Let us give them something so they will keep quiet."

Without going into that, I, personally, think that is not at all a wise view. The reason I mention the subject at all is that I feel quite definitely that in so far as the demand for colonies with Germany as official backer as it has appeared to have, I think it is a bluff. You see the demand for equality in all things which all German governments have been proclaiming for many years now. That demand for equality is now in danger of being rather lost. I mean Germany has taken practically all the things which she said prevented her from being on an equality with other nations. Colonies she still has not. Therefore, it is a good agitation point and I think largely from the point of view of that prestige is the fact that she is to some extent pretending to be officially interested in colonies. No, I don't believe Hitler's view on that subject has much changed since he wrote "Mein Kampf," and in that great work you remember he is very emphatically of the opinion that the colonial era is over and that Germany cannot solve any problems by colonies outside Europe.

Now, in my opinion the aim of Germany is new territory in Europe and the territory on which she has her eye is the Ukraine. Coupled with that is the desire for domination, economic and political of Central and Eastern Europe. Just as Mussolini is convinced he is the reincarnation of Julius Caesar, so is Goering convinced he is the predestined German Colossus bestriding Europe. Vienna is slated to be the purged capital of the new holy German Empire. Therefore, it is not from mere cussedness that the powers are preventing the Austrian people from self determination. They realize, everybody realizes, Italy included, that Germany in Vienna today would mean Germany in Trieste, in Belgrade, in Bucharest and possibly in Strasbourg tomorrow. As Spengler has said, Germany is a country in the making.

Well, these German aims are obtainable at the expense and only at the expense of both Great Britain and France. Therefore. it is my opinion that those Germans who are determined on this policy and who have thought things through must see before they can launch on it they must be or consider themselves to be materially in a strong enough position to knock out both Britain and France. By "to knock out," I don't say conquer, but to knock them out of the fighting line. The present stage is that of the attempt to cross the diplomatic threads, to cause and profit by any dissension which exists between those nations which are not too friendly to Germany and it is also a period which Hitler very well described in "Mein Kampf," that in which the chief aim of their foreign policy is seeking of comrades in arms.

Goering fancies himself as a great statesman. You may remember, he got married this year to Emmy Sonnemann, the actress, and in the Spring he made a honeymoon tour, not maybe the sort of honeymoon most of us would enjoy. He toured around Europe in an aeroplane, and was trailed everywhere by another big aeroplane filled with European officials, and he spent most of his honeymoon wining and dining and banquetting these officials. As a aid to the anti-French bloc, it had its uses. Though it was not an outstanding success, it was a negative success for it taught the Germans what they could not do, at least.

Since then the German diplomacy has been carried on in this new form which I have called a hunting party diplomacy. It is at the hunting parties the attempt to form a Fascist bloc is being pursued.

Superficially, it would seem almost inevitable with such strong nations so whole-heartedly Facist, it would seem inevitable they must come together. There are a lot of people who say it is coming, that is must come. I don't quite agree with that. I think, tempting as it is to believe it and by and large this must be, particularly when one is a long way from the scene of action, nevertheless I feel the more you study the details, the more the difficulties get almost into the realm of the insuperable.

I am just going to run hurriedly over some of the chief difficulties. Poland. In any Facist bloc alignment, Poland must be the kingpin of the outfit. Now, the Polish people, although they are now being told all the nice things about Germany and nothing unpleasant as they have been for at least two generations, and the same applies of the Germans in Germany, nevertheless, the Polish people find it very hard to believe that Germany has forgotten all about the Corridor. Colonel Beck, the Polish Foreign Minister is motivated partly by personal considerations. He dislikes the French very much. He was turned out of Paris as Military Attaché, and he has the support of some of the large landowners in Poland, but so far as I can see he doesn't get away with the majority of the mass of the people.

More interesting, certainly more important in attempting to establish the likelihood of German success is the fact that despite the extremely pro-German policy of Poland during the last two years particularly, relations between the French General Staff and the Polish General Staff have hardly changed at all, or at least they had not changed up to a very few weeks ago. That is important because after all it is the Polish General Staff which in the long run has, I would say, more in the last word in Polish affairs than the French Staff has in French affairs at the moment and the Polish staff officers remember that in 1922 when Soviet Russia was overrunning Poland the French General Staff saved the day. They have a holy terror of history repeating itself and Germany getting in bad again with some neighbour and, in other words, being in a spot where they would be badly in need of help and finding the French General Staff turning a deaf ear. Therefore, though one reads time after time about the increasing pro-German attitude and policy of Poland, I still remain skeptical as to the likelihood of Poland breaking away definitely from the status quo bloc.

I believe myself the showdown will come next March and it is a moment which I would rather like to commend to your attention, to watch the papers at the time. If the Polish-Roumanian Treaty is renewed at that time—it comes up for renewal then—then I think that its renewal will be almost a definite sign to Goering that his diplomacy has failed. On the other hand, if she refuses to renew it, it will certainly be a sign to France that she must take the pro-German tendency of Polish policies very, very seriously, indeed. So, by and large, one must write the success of Goering in this diplomatic attempt as doubtful.

Now, Hungary. Hungary is a small nation, a weak nation. They have had long conferences with the Germans. They feel very flattered that such a great country should be courting them and asking for their help but they have very few illusions as to the extent to which Germany would consider the sentiment of the cat's paw, after she had gained her end. In other words, while the big fellow is getting into the saddle it is very nice but after he is in the saddle, the situation may change. That is the fundamental situation, so far as I can gather in the nation of Hungary. I have found in business circles in Hungary considerable antagonism, certainly no enthusiasm for the pro-German policies of the Hungarian people. One other outstanding reason why Hungary must be very careful where she steps in this matter of a Facist bloc is that the Magyars are isolated in Europe. They are surrounded by Slavs and Germans. They are neither the one nor the other. The Slavs are of oriental origin. They are racially isolated from the Slavs. They know they have nothing to look for, in the sense that Panslavism is dead, and even though the Slavs want to turn Hungary from the Germans they have some justification in being a little less certain about it. Therefore, Hungary, much though her Premier apparently would like to, is likely to be pretty chary in tying herself up to the German chariot.

As regards Italy, there is general uncertainty there. Everything depends on the outcome of the Ethiopian adventure. I don't pretend to know anything about that but I would just like to say that in the few conversations I have had since I came to Canada, I have found rather surprising the wide spread view that it is going to be a walkover for Italy. I, as I say, know nothing about it, but I assure you that view is by no means very common in Europe. The fundamental thing, however, is that they don't know whether Italy can be a useful member of the Facist bloc. It is entirely uncertain. Nobody knows where Mussolini will be a year hence, much less what will happen to Facist Italy. The fundamental thing in the relations of Italy and Germany, whether Facist or anything else is that an all-powerful Germany sitting on the precipice has been and always will be a threat to Italy. That, then, would become a threat to Trieste which Italy took from Austria after the war. Austria, another potential Facist ally is officially anti-Nazi and pro-Italian.

That pretty well sums up the picture. It is a platitude, Gentlemen, to say we are living on a volcano in Europe. That, roughly, is the volcano. In my opinion, I disagree with those who say the volcano may explode any moment, simply because we are living on a volcano. People say it has to come some moment, that it may come any minute. I think, though irrational to an unprecedented degree, at the moment we are in one of those possibly very short lulls in which one can say an explosion is not likely to occur. I repeat, it may be a very, very short time. I believe the possible moment of eruption of the volcano will come from the moment when Goering and the German Nazi leaders, if or when they are finally convinced their attempt to produce a great diplomatic success have definitely failed. From that moment on, I think explosion is possible.

Well, Gentlemen, that is merely the diagnosis of a wanderer. Very inadequate, full of implications, but you may remember, to quote our friend, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, a few weeks ago he said, "When I examine international relations, I really feel I am living in a mad house." If that is the opinion of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, I would hope you wouldn't expect the likes of me to reduce everything to a lucid and a logical conclusion. (Hearty applause.)

MR. BOURLIER: In thanking the speaker of the day, Mr. Brown, may I refer in brief to the address we had last week on "Britain's New Responsibilities," and say how well the two addresses combined will give us a picture of the very troubled situation, politically, in Europe today. We greatly appreciate Mr. Brown's coming to us and I am sure I only voice your sentiment to him when I say that we have listened with rapt interest to his commentary on the situation abroad. (Applause.)

THE ART OF LIVING

AN ADDRESS GIVEN BY HIS EXCELLENCY, BARON TWEEDSMUIR, THE GOVERNOR GENERAL OF CANADA

Thursday, November 28th, 1935

This was a meeting of the Canadian Club to which members of the Empire Club were invited as guests.

COL. ARTHUR L. BISHOP, chairman, opening the meeting, said: Your Excellency, my Lord, fellow members of the Empire Club—I am a member of the Empire Club myself—Gentlemen: We all have sincere feelings of satisfaction that we have as our guest of honour today His Excellency, Lord Tweedsmuir, representing His Majesty in Person, Crown and dignity. It has been said in cable reports that at the time His Majesty was pleased to appoint Lord Tweedsmuir to this high office he was looking forward with lively expectation, and lively anticipation to the post he was to fill. He might well do so, for Canada certainly affords many opportunities for mental gymnastics for anybody at Ottawa. The great resources of nature with which this country is so richly blessed and its resources of the mind and spirit might well foster within him a lively anticipation and a vigorous hope of carrying out his duties well and truly. And that he will do so is the fervent hope of all Canadians. It has been said that His Excellency was appointed at the express wish of the two leaders of the political parties in Canada, and in making the appointment His Majesty did not deviate from what we might call the national Canadian ideal. Kingship in these latter days has come to mean something very close and very precious to all British peoples, regardless of race, religion, creed or colour, for the art of Kingship —in these days especially—resolves itself into leadership in the higher art of living. Our distinguished guest is so richly endowed with all that pertains to this art that we know our cultural life will be very greatly enhanced. He comes, not as a stranger, but rather as an old familiar fireside friend. The name of John Buchan is known in every house in Canada for the windows he has opened for us on history and romance. And he has brought enjoyment, comfort, and a hearty admiration for those characters he has caused to dance—if I may be allowed to mix my metaphors—upon the stage of the fifty books he has written. Scottish hearts will glow with pride throughout the course of his journeys across Canada—from Victoria to Halifax, and from the 49th parallel of latitude to the subarctic, perhaps more than twice during his term of office. It is this personal contact with all our Canadian people that makes them glow with the thought that by it they have contact with the very Throne itself, as personified in his Excellency. The names in the country through which he passes will sound familiar to him. There is a town of Buchan in Manitoba, and he will find a McNab within 25 miles of Toronto—and it was founded I believe by a John McNab. There is a Tweed in Ontario and Lady Tweedsmuir will find a familiar ring in the name of Grosvenor in Nova Scotia. We shall be glad of Their Excellencies' leadership and we can appreciate how great that leadership will be in the things of the heart and mind with which they are so richly endowed. To-day I am going to reverse our normal procedure of introducing the speaker to the audience, and introduce the audience to the speaker. Your Excellency, the members of the Canadian and Empire Clubs.

HIS EXCELLENCY, THE GOVERNOR GENERAL: Colonel Bishop, Your Grace, Gentlemen of the Canadian and Empire Clubs: I must begin by thanking you most sincerely for your wonderful welcome. I am very glad to be amongst you again, for I have the happiest recollections of my visit eleven years ago when I spoke to the Empire Club. I can't remember what I talked about on that occasion but it was probably politics. To-day my style is rather cramped for I must keep away very strictly from the discussion of public affairs. But you gentlemen of the two clubs have always been very generous in permitting a speaker a wide area in the choice of what he will speak about to you. In casting about for a subject on which to speak to you I thought I would talk to you on the Art of Living, and the great influence that the enjoyment of the pleasures of life has on professional efficiency. I presume that I am speaking to an audience of business and professional men. For a quarter of a century I was a business man myself, so I hope that I understand something of your problems and difficulties. As the years go by and one gets to the other side of the hill, one is tempted to generalize from one's own experience. I have led an active life and have enjoyed every moment of it, and I have always had an extraordinary aptitude for taking holidays.

I want to offer you a few observations on those seasons when our harness is unloosed and we are turned out to grass. I want to stress the importance of leisure in life —of what remains when we have finished the jobs by which we earn our daily bread. I am a Scot and an elder of the Kirk, so I will take a text. And my text will be the words of Ecclesiasticus who said "The wisdom of the learned cometh by opportunity of leisure. He that hath little business shall become wise." Like an old Free Kirk Minister I would like to call your attention to the first clause of the verse: Wisdom cometh by opportunity of leisure, for I am not altogether sure that I agree with the second.

This is an enormous subject with many extensions into sociology and economics. To-day we are witnessing the triumph of the machine, and this triumph has meant that a great deal of the monotonous exacting toil of the past has been superseded. It has given us more leisure and we must find new interests for that leisure. The mechanization of the world must mean a drastic reconstruction of industry. The worker will be rationed with fewer hours of labour, and this enforced leisure time will have to be filled up with new employments and new interests. There are some who dream of the time when a man will have comparatively few regular hours of work, and that in what remains of his time he may be able to produce, as craftsman or farmer, the necessities and some of the luxuries of his life. The machine, if we make it our slave instead of making ourselves slaves to it, may end by performing the part that slave labour did in the old Greek world, and give everyone of us a richer and fuller life.

Then there is the cultural side of leisure. No man, if he is to live a full and worthy life can live only for his business or profession. We are all human beings as well as doctors, accountants, lawyers and engineers, and we have to get satisfaction out of life as well as a living. The wise man will cultivate many interests outside his actual profession, things which keep the mind alive. There is a satisfaction that comes from books, and another that we can reach through contact with wild nature. You in Canada have a wonderful opportunity here. Then there is the field of sport. You remember Sir Andrew Aguecheek in Twelfth Night who declared that to learn foreign languages was a waste of time when there were so many bears to bait. There are still many bears to bait, and to have many interests keeps a man young. James Bryce was a most extraordinary example of how perpetual activity can keep a man young. I had a long talk with him once when he was well over 80, and he told me of how much amusement he was getting from planning to write a life of the Emperor Justinian.

To-day I am going to be most severely practical. My thesis is the value of leisure, for the efficiency of leisure for our own professional work. That applies to every profession, every vocation and every branch of commerce and industry. My argument is that leisure—rightly used leisure—is essential to our professional success. The secret of success is to do one's job with a minimum of labour. I do not mean by this the use of labour-saving appliances that often complicate the job to be done. What I do mean is that we should apply intelligence, for intelligence saves waste, and most jobs are done with an absurd waste of labour. As an example I would like to speak of a subject of which General Mitchell probably knows a good deal more than I do—I mean military intelligence. When the war began we found it necessary to provide an element of surprise and to provide this absolute secrecy was necessary. We carried our methods to absurd extremes with an enormous host of officials and a tremendous expenditure of money. The German Government carried it still further, and it all failed. In the end we learnt that in order to keep a thing secret, it was wise to allow 99 per cent of the subject to be as public as possible, in order that the one per cent that remained might be concealed because it was not recognized. In this way we allowed the enemy to have an immense amount of information that was quite accurate, but which was of no particular value, and thereby concealed the small part that did matter. Many imagine that the more work they put into a job the better it will be done. The notion comes from the old Puritan theology which took a very grave view of life and spent its day between work and devotional exercises. "Give every flying minute something to keep in store." Good advice provided that you bring intelligence to bear on it. It is easy to put too much work into a job, and the emphasis on toil is apt to make us forget the prior necessity of intelligence, so that we waste a lot of time. A few years ago a certain angler set out to fish a loch on the Scottish border. On the way he met a man cutting hay, who gave him good morning and wished him luck. He got to the loch and fished all day, catching nothing. He tried every ruse he knew and every fly he had without result. In the evening he put up his rod and was going away, tired and disappointed when he met the man who had been cutting hay going home to his supper. The man said, "Any luck, sir?" and he replied that he had not, with the customary adjectives of an angry angler. "I am not surprised," said the man. "There never has been a fish in that loch since the creation of the world." Now that angler lacked the preliminary information and reflection that means success. Lack of intelligent reflection means waste because without it we cannot see round our task sufficiently. Again I repeat that properly used leisure is as essential to success as a proper spying out of the ground, before we begin a stalk.

It is the same in business. The larger part of it is a matter of detail and regular routine. No particular qualities are necessary for this part of it except industry and experience. And herein lies a danger, for if we allow routine to bulk too largely in our minds, we lose sight of the wood and even of the trees because of our absorption in the undergrowth. In Britain after the war business men did not realize that conditions had changed completely, and were content to go on in the same old rut. When the time did come that they looked around their jobs, they found that the time for reconstruction had passed and they were left high and dry. America before 1929 was an interesting case. The young American, who was ready to start in business, had the best education that you could find. He had been to university and had learnt something of the humanities. He had probably been to law school, travelled abroad and had been thoroughly trained in the technique of his own business. Success in business they regarded as something sacred. They worked inordinately long hours and had practically no private life. But in spite of their enthusiasm I was worried about them for they seemed not to be looking round their jobs, or to be cognizant of the very black thunder clouds that were gathering. I talked about it to a very good friend of mine—a successful man. I told him of my experience and he said, "You are perfectly right, these boys have got hold of the wrong end of the stick. I should consider myself a failure if I went to the office more than five days a week or stayed there more than a few hours a day." I said to him, "And when you go home what do you do?" and he said "I sit in the garden or go fishing, and I get a whale of a lot of thinking done." That I am sure was the reason for his success.

It is the same in all jobs. In soldiering, for instance, intelligence is essential to success. A general needs to keep a detached view to see round his job properly and win battles. He must keep outside the melee to maintain the proper perspective. Let us, too, consider the law from this point of view. The law allows a certain amount of leisure, to the barrister at any rate, for the Courts have a lovable habit of not always sitting. The barrister has ample time to see round his subject, and the greatest lawyers have always been men of wide general interests. A proper sense of proportion is a vital necessity of their job, and the cultivation of plentiful leisure helps them enormously. The same is true of statesmanship. There never was a profession that more clearly required the wide cultivation of outside interests. And of the wide value of this cultivation Lord Balfour is an outstanding example. He was a remarkable scientist, and by any standard a notable philosopher. He was, above all, a wonderful listener. I remember that he used to make my own halting utterances sound respectable. He never allowed himself to become immersed in detail, but used his leisure—and he insisted on having a great deal of leisure—to further his power as leader of the nation. I once spoke to a wise Trade Union leader and he said "The secret of success is always keep on the top of your job. But you cannot keep on the top of your job if you are mixed up in it." You must be able to see all round it, and for that you require the right use of leisure.

There were days when people thought a great deal about the saving of their souls. Then, you retired from soldiering, or statesmanship, or whatever was your job, and in the close of life went into retreat to settle accounts with life and make your peace with heaven. We don't talk quite in that language today, but the need is still insistent. But that task is not to be performed only in seclusion in the twilight of life, it must go on all our days. Someone has written that every man should be lonely at heart. That is not so easy in this bustling world. We all must spend too much time on the treadmill without vision or perspective in our work, and often with a most intolerable clatter in our ears. But sometimes we must get out of the din and discover ourselves. We all need the virtues of solitude, for we must all be solitary in the great crises of life, and we must all be alone at death. That is the greatest of the fruits of leisure, for it gives us a chance to discover ourselves, the opportunity to assess true values and to give our souls that rest and returning which should be our strength.

COLONEL BISHOP said: We have to-day as our guests the members of the Empire Club, of which I understand His Excellency has just accepted the office of Honorary President. That, I understand from His Excellency, is one of the penalties of his office, but it gives us no small pleasure to have the members of the Empire Club with us to-day. Mr. Brace is here and I am going to ask him to propose a vote of thanks to His Excellency.

J. H. BRACE, president of the Empire Club: Mr. President, Your Excellency, Honoured Guests, and Gentlemen: First I would like to present to the president of the Canadian Club the thanks of the members of the Empire Club for inviting us to be here with you to-day. And at this time, on behalf of the members of the Empire Club, I would like to extend our sincere thanks for the honour conferred upon us by His Excellency in accepting the honourary presidency of our organization. His Excellency is no stranger to Canadians. We have known him for years as student, scholar, and illustrious writer. By his works ye shall know him, and during the next five years His Excellency will have many opportunities of drawing closer the ties that bind us to the Motherland. During the past five years many of us have had too much leisure, and many of us have been kept too close to the grindstone. It is to be hoped that as prosperity again comes there will be a more equal distribution of work and leisure. By his Office His Excellency forms a link with the Empire, and we would not have it otherwise. To His Excellency is happening an event of serious import, for he is bringing to us thoughts and ideas from the Motherland and the interpreting these for our better understanding, and we must have a common understandig so that those things which are for the benefit of the Empire as a whole may be carried out. I am sure I am expressing the thoughts of all here when I extend to His Excellency our thanks for his most thoughtful and delightful address.

THE ART THAT CONCEALS ART

An Address by MR. CLEMENT MAY

Thursday, December 5th, 1935

President: Gentlemen, there are certain events in all our lives of which we have very definite and vivid impressions. I recall distinctly in the year 1916 one evening that the Montreal arena, which has since been destroyed, was filled to capacity. I recall that the Duke and Duchess of Connaught were sitting in the royal box. The event was a recital given by Madame Melba. Probably many of you remember that tour which she made, all the money which was collected during the tour being turned over in its entirety to the Red Cross. The last song that Madame Melba gave to that large audience was Tosti's "Good-Bye." It actually was Madame Melba's good-bye to Canada.

Today as our guest speaker we are having another famed Australian, one who is little known in Canada as yet because this is his first visit to our country. He, however, is well known throughout other parts of the British Empire and after a few recitals such as some of us had the opportunity to hear last Monday in Eaton Auditorium I am sure our guest speaker will endear himself to the hearts of all Canadians. After hearing Mr. May interpret a number of the characters of Dickens I am not so surprised at the growth of the Dickens Fellowship Societies across the face of the globe. I feel, after hearing His Excellency, the Governor General last week suggest to us that we might use our leisure hours to greater advantage, that many of us have a real opportunity in studying Dickens in our leisure hours more than we have during the past. I know that the presentations made by Mr. May have convinced me that this is one way in which I am going to enjoy myself in future.

I tried to get some biography of Mr. May. He told me he was born at an early age. He says his college career came through experience and that his experiences in his own art started at a very early age. Mr. May is going to speak to us today on the subject: "The Art That Conceals Art." Gentlemen, I have very much pleasure indeed in introducing to you Mr. Clement May.

MR. CLEMENT MAY: Mr. President, Members of this Empire Club: Let me say I appreciate the honour that you have given me to say a few words to you today. I might tell you that I feel much more at home recreating the works of other people than I do creating my own thoughts. You know it is a different thing to create your own words and speak them than it is to take the master minds like Shakespeare and Dickens and try to visualize those wonderful creations mentally, physically, and vocally, but I can assure you it is much easier for me to do that than to give an address as it were, off my own bat.

The subject that I have chosen is "The Art That Conceals Art." Might I at the outset bring to you a little conversation that took place many years ago (it would have to be many years ago) between a learned Divine and the great David Garrick, the greatest master of the drama of his time. Garrick at that time was packing his theatre six nights in the week and the poor Bishop couldn't pack it one night on a Sunday. So, one day, meeting with Garrick he said, "Can you tell me how it is that you, only a strolling player can pack your theatre every night when the things you say are only fiction when I who speak the truth can not fill my great church one night in the week?"

Garrick said, "It is simple. I speak fiction as if it were but truth; you speak truth as if it were but fiction." And it is very, very often the case.

I remember, and that comes under the heading I am speaking of, how many people forget or do not use that most wonderful gift of the Creator, the human voice. There is no power in the world that I know of that has the power of the human voice. There is no machine invented that can do what the great human voice can do. It can make and unmake nations. It can lift the powers of a nation. It can destroy them. Without the power of the human voice today I am afraid Mussolini wouldn't be where he is, judging by what I can hear over the wireless. Some of the art of concealing art is in almost every mode of expression. The great painter is more fortunate than the strolling player or the orator because his work lives after him. The sculptor's work lives after him. But in the case of the poor actor or the strolling player or the preacher or the orator, his work dies with him. How wonderful it is when you hear a man who has all the magnificence of production, who knows how to colour his voice and can bring out every tone in a word and every sound that creates the beauty of a sentence!

I don't know whether you know it or not but a tribute to the late Sir Henry Irving was that he was the greatest reader of Holy Writ of all time. An instance of that was on his first visit to the United States. The skipper of the vessel came to him on the Saturday night and asked him if he would take the service and read on the Sunday on the boat. He said, "No, I would rather somebody else did it. You see, I am not a preacher, I am a strolling player. The skipper said, "Well, it is a request we have from many of the passengers that you read tomorrow morning." He accepted and I believe it is true that everybody who could be spared in the ship from down the stoke-hole and every sailor was brought up into the saloon to hear that man read the service on the Sunday morning which I believe absolutely enraptured everyone who listened to him. But the great compliment came from the stoke-hole when later on one of the stokers returned down below and one of his fellows down there who hadn't the pleasure of being up, who probably was on duty, said, "What was the old chap like?" The stoker said, "It's the first time I knew what the blinking thing meant." That was a compliment from a man of that description. He knew what it meant. How often do we go and we don't know what it means because the art that conceals the art is too artificial.

I remember many years ago (it would be because the centenary, I believe, of Mark Twain is close at hand) Mark Twain arrived in a city I was brought up in where they had one of the finest stage coaches in the Southern Hemisphere and Mark, in his "Travels Abroad" said he paid a visit to a place called Ballarat,, a wonderful city, a place where they teach you to talk the King's English. He said, "When I met the Mayor, he said, 'Kim.' When I asked him to have a cigar, he said, 'Kew.' I thought for a moment, who is Kim and Kew? They must be two notable people. I found out after that they meant 'Welcome' and 'Thank you,' so I knew they spoke English there.

The human voice which expresses so much and which carries so much conviction, either when you are recreating a character or when you are giving out something in the third person can be trained and used to such an extent that there is no instrument to compare with it. Some people say, 'Well, how will you get that effect?" You can't get it by merely the repetition of words because it is the brain that colours the voice. It isn't merely the voice, the voice is only a servant of the brain. The incident your President mentioned just now brings to my mind a time years ago when I was listening in the Conservatory to the late great Madame Melba. I remember my teacher said, "You had better go and hear this woman sing in "The Mad Scene" from Ambroise Thomas's Hamlet.' He asked me a few days after, "What did you think of it?" One or two of us were quite certain that she went off the key. He looked at us a moment. "O, did she? How do you know that?"

"Well, it sounded as if she were off the key." He said, "In what part?" I said, "In the Mad Song." He said, "She was, too. Thank God." He said, "Don't you understand that it is that wonderful brain directing that God-given voice that is vacillating between sanity and insanity, and that she wavered off the key but came back on as the brain came back? She was living that wonderful song, mentally and physically and expressing it vocally. That is what you have." So she disguised the art and concealed it in the art of concealing her art.

Just the same you take some of the most famous characters from the great works of the great Dickens. Some will tell you today that Dickens is dead. I had a man tell me the other day, "They don't like Dickens, old chap, it is finished." Well, my experience is this, that Dickens will never die so long as the British tongue remains what it is today and the reason for it, from my point of view is that the characters that Dickens created were not fictitious characters. They were living people, they were people that breathed, people he saw, people he put down with that wonderful photographic brain. Not only did he put them down from an exterior point of view but he put them down from an interior point of view. He knew the very movement of their brains. The very words he put into the mouth of that delightful prince of optimism, Micawber, is enough to tell you how he understands that wonderful vacillating brain. How many Micawbers are in this room? How many Micawbers are in every city you get into? At the present time I think a lot of us are waiting for something to turn up and I really hope that before long something will turn up and will make this world a real place of peace to live in. To my mind, the human voice can do so much to do that.

In travelling over the Continent of America and meeting quite a number of people and addressing one or two very fine Clubs, I have said this, and have heard it said before and probably since, "If we English-speaking people or those that speak the same language could only band together and use that language as a means to bring about a better understanding with our fellowmen!" Dickens had more to do with that than any other author. He understands his fellowmen and in every character he drew, even the names of those characters sounded like the people they belonged to, to my mind. Where could you get a more perfect name for a cringing hypocrite than Uriah Heep? And hasn't a sound like dear old Wilkins Micawber itself got a light in it? Fagin, the Jew—all of those characters. But the art that conceals the art is when you forget the mere words that belong to those characters and immerse yourself for the time being into those characters and the words will carry their own weight and carry your audience, as I have found. It doesn't do always to get too far into a character. You might not come back and nobody wants to be twisted into Uriah Heep or into Fagin or into that fearful creation and wonderful characterization of Quilp. Might I tell you just in passing, I remember many years ago a man named Fred B. Marshall, one of the greatest men of his time, who played the part of Quilp. It was one of those wonderful creations that put the great stories of Dickens on the map from a theatre point of view, but Fred B. Marshall was such a master of that character that it wasn't a character, it was an embodiment of some glorious creation of the great master mind, but unfortunately his brain wasn't equal to the strain which he put on it. You see you can only play a character according to your mental and physical power. The moment you put a strain on it over that, something is going to go wrong and that man turned into that character of Quilp and played it many, many months afterward in an asylum. So you see, it doesn't do to play a character too many times because the art of concealing art might bring you to somebody else but yourself.

It might interest you to know and probably some of you do, that two of the finest voices in England for many years, so far as beauty of tone, colour and expression was first that of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and second to that or almost equal was that of that gorgeous lady, Ellen Terry. It has been said that those two people, Her Majesty, the Queen, and Ellen Terry had the two most glorious voices of Britain. Ellen Terry will tell you in her book that it took her a long time of life study in order to do what she could do with that wonderful voice of hers, how she had it under control and how she was taught to use it. I often wonder, do we pay enough attention to our speech today? Does the man in the street pay enough attention to it? You very often hear people cutting their words down until it is very hard to understand what they really say. It is all a force of habit. It isn't because we don't know but we are so used to using that wonderful gift slovenly that you don't get the beauty out of it that people should get from the human voice. Speaking of the art of concealing art, it doesn't only lend itself to the art of speaking or the art of expression. To my mind it lends itself to the art of governing and that art is concealed. When I went through the great Indian Empire for ten months I wondered then at the art of governing and how that little Island of Britain could control the teeming millions of that wonderful continent, almost with an unseen hand. Some people say it is done by the power of the sword. Mixing with several very prominent Mahommedans in the great Mahommedan Club in Delhi, I found a different story altogether and one which I think probably you, as members of the Empire Club might appreciate. It was in 1915, during the troublous times of the Great War, and I said to a man named Ramkreshor Jaitley, a very eminent barrister in the Club, "What is your impression of the British rule here?" He said, "It would be a sad day if Britain took away the armies from India. It would be the greatest tragedy that ever occurred to us. She governs us in such a way that she doesn't interfere with us. She has improved our country, in our banking and in every department of life she has made life so different since she took charge of this great Empire," but the one thing that stuck in my mind was what he said in conclusion: "She has never interfered with our religious rights," and as a Britisher travelling through that vast Empire, I was truly proud, as every Britisher, I think, would be to know that they that you meet by the way will tell you that it is the best thing that they ever had, and the best thing for India. (Applause.)

Going back for a moment to some of the characters from Dickens. It has been said that in those wonderful works there is something like 2,500 characters being created out of that little brain. I don't suppose there is an author who has ever created so many characters as Charles Dickens has done and those characters as you know have become almost household people and friends. They are more than characters from a novel. You meet people everywhere you go that resemble those characters. I have met many people who knew Dickens in the flesh and who could tell me some very fine things connected with his life, but the man who interested me most was, naturally, Alfred Tennyson Dickens, his son, who lived for some years in Australia and I can tell you, having had the pleasure of being in his company for a considerable time that any story about Dickens not being a father in every sense of the word, according to what Alfred Tennyson Dickens told me, is all wrong. According to what he said, not once but several times, he was an ideal father and certainly a lover of his children. I am very sorry that even today there is a new book just arrived trying to condemn the character of the great and immortal Dickens. What a pity that people have got to spend their time after a great man has passed away to try to degrade his wonderful memory when he, himself, cannot defend it.

Going back to the characters of Dickens, there you get the art of expression. As the old masters have told us, if you can get a good grip on the characters and the writings of Shakespeare and the writings and characters of Dickens, you are pretty safe wherever you go, so far as understanding the expressions of the English language and there is no doubt about it that these characters can be taken to pretty well every part of the civilized world. One of the great things today in the education of our people, I think, is by means of our wireless which can travel so far away. I had no idea until 1923 what the power of the wireless really was, but in that year, the Christmas of 1923, I was asked by the VK3LR station in Melbourne, Victoria, to broadcast Dickens' Christmas Carol. I was afforded a very fine opportunity owing to the leading theatrical firm having a certain interest in that station and they gave me a very fine company of actors and actresses in order to perform that work. Now, standing there in that room on the Christmas Eve with a choir of eighty voices for the carol singing and a big orchestra for incidental music, little did we dream or did I dream where those listening might be situated, but as time went on we had letters from all over the Pacific, from the far wastes of the northern territory of Australia and when I began to read those letters I thought what a wonderful power this is for civilization and the education of the masses if it is not abused.

I will tell you just one or two little instances that might interest you. Here are two men slinging a wire, as they call it, from Port Darwin down to the south of Australia through the great "never ever" country., This is the letter we received two nonths after. They are five hundred miles from the nearest railway, away out in the great wastes of the Australian Continent of three million square miles, and there comes a letter written in a rough hand:

"Dear Sir: You might like to know what lies behind the microphone into which you speak. We are miles from civilization. There are two of us and there is not a living soul. There is a wire slung from two gum trees. We have the ear phones on our ears. The little machine is working well. There is a bottle but only a candle in it and it is Christmas Eve."

(I felt sorry for those two. Christmas Eve and only a candle in the bottle! One thing they had something to light their way.) They said, "We have listened to the glorious music. We have listened to the wonderful message of the Christmas Carol. Thank God for you and Christmas."

From the Island of Noumea there came a similar message, from Honolula there came messages, from the way-back stations of Australia and from all the islands around the Pacific we got messages. They came in for months afterwards telling us they had heard the Christmas carols and to some of the people isolated on the islands it must have been a wonderful treat to sit in the little places or gather in some small hall and listen to the most wonderful message ever written by any author, that is the message of Charles Dickens' Christmas Carol. I don't think I ever heard a sermon more beautiful than the Christmas Carol. I might be wrong but sometimes I think Old Scrooge is much maligned. Dickens didn't mean him to be the old rascal some people think he was. Dickens put him there for a purpose. I often wonder if Old Scrooge had married early in life whether he would have been a different man. I think it was Scrooge's loneliness that made him such a miserable old beggar. When a man is lonely and miserable no matter what money he is making, he can't make love to it, he can only count it. I think Old Scrooge was not the hard old fellow that some people think he was. He was a bit misguided but Dickens put him in that form and brought back his former partner, Marley, to tell him he was all wrong. Then he brought him back after the dream as Dickens did in that gorgeous story, to tell you what Christianity really was. I read that a great American author said it was the greatest little book ever written and there are two firms in the British Empire that I have the greatest reverence for. You might be surprised to know who they are—Buchanan's Whisky and Pears Soap. Do you know why? At Dickens' centenary, Buchanan's Whisky distributed some millions of glorious folios, reprints by two famous artists of characters from Dickens and they were sent all around the world. I know, as I got some in Africa, in India, in Australia, in Tasmania and New Zealand. They must have printed a goodly number. They were beautifully gotten up to commemorate the centennial of Dickens' birth. And Pears Soap must have sent out some million copies of the Christmas Carol with their compliments to commemorate the memory of Dickens, so I think those people are to be honoured and respected, even though you don't like their whisky or don't use their soap. They certainly did a wonderful work.

Take the character of that glorious old sea-faring man, Dan Peggotty. A man with a heart of gold but a lovely, simple child-like nature. When you go along Yarmouth among the old fishermen as I used to, to hear the way they talk, to hear the lovely burr in their voices, you saw how Dickens depicted that wonderful old fisherman and there was that glorious old character with his lovely mind like a child's until the tragedy came in and little Emily departed out of his life. There are many men like that today. Those men still exist. Those characters still exist somewhere. There is no doubt about it, Peggotty was a living being according to Dickens and he is a living being according to those who understand him. Peggotty was one of those gloriously drawn men. You can see them all along the water front at Yarmouth, even today. One man said one time, "But I don't believe, I don't believe any man existed like Sidney Carton in "The Tale of Two Cities." Why didn't he live? Why don't he exist? Does a man lay down his life for his fellowmen? Of course he does. Sidney Carton laid down his life for a friend. He knew he was useless. He knew he was cursed with something which he had no power over and the only way he could pay was for the woman he loved to be happy. And those things occur today just as they did as Dickens wrote of them. You can go down Petticoat Lane and meet dozens of Fagins. I have gone around the corner in Petticoat Lane and have bumped into a glorious prototype of dear old Fagin. I remember one morning I roamed down and bumped into such a charming Hebrew character with a sack on his back, that I said, "Hello, Fagin, how are you?" He said, "Uh?" I said, "You look like Fagin." "Who's he?" I said, "Some one very much like you." He said, "I don't know 'im." They live all right! You have only to go out in the night sometimes in London and walk and that is when you hear London talk. The art that conceals art still breathes in the City of London because it is the art of living. You can go as Dickens went and as I was very, very prone to do, go out in the dead of night and listen to the beating of the great City of London. I have gone out and stayed out half the night, walking the old streets to listen to the sounds and see the characters that creep along the wall even today. The Artful Dodger, he still exists with his nimble fingers. Why only in 1921, there was a case in the Bow Street Police Court of where they had caught an old Jew down in Petticoat Lane with a number of children from four years of age and he was teaching them exactly the same as Fagin taught them. They were still being taught to use their nimble fingers and get away with the watches and he flogged them and sent them back if they didn't succeed in doing what he told them to do. He got five years hard labour, I am glad to say. There he was, still existing, and every one of those characters exists and you see them They might be in a different form but you can't get away from the fact that those characters live and live still today.

You know, strange as it might seem, the elder Irving was credited with being a marvellous comedian. He wouldn't admit it. He felt that it was derogatory to his great power to be a comedian. One of the finest characters he ever did was Alfred Jingle. He wasn't too keen on doing that character. He didn't want to go down in the great history of the stage as a comedian, but that character he recreated in the most marvellous manner.

Very often when I have been travelling I have gone into a cathedral or a church somewhere and I have listened sometimes to some one who has a message for mankind and really I have found it very hard to listen with any degree of appreciation because of the method of the delivery and the expression of that message was so clouded by a bad delivery and a bad mental attitude to that subject, that it was almost impossible to follow. Yet, when you read in the morning paper the day after the subject of that matter was glorious. I remember Dean Linden Parkin, who was a great advocate for good speaking, telling me that one time after he had gone up to hear a great preacher in London, when I asked him what he though of him, "I had a headache when he started and a headache when he finished because he kept on the one note all the time and never altered it and he screamed that note the whole of the evening." Now, his subject matter to read the next morning was wonderful. That is why I say the art of the human voice can so charm people and so uplift men and so entertain them that it is a pity that that voice is not more looked after and trained by the average person.

I have seen a learned Bishop in my city who could not draw more than a quarter of a congregation in his cathedral, yet a most eminent Divine and a most wonderful scholar. On the following Sunday I have seen and heard Dean Linden Parkin when it was like getting into the doors of a fashionable play, because that man not alone had a message to give you but he knew every tone of the human voice and how to express it. There is no instrument that can make you laugh, can make you cry, can make you think, can bring everything into the human frame like a human voice. Why, I heard David Lloyd

George in 1921, and we know what an orator David Lloyd George is. Whether you believe his politics or not is a totally different thing but as a speaker and an orator it is a long time since I heard such a flow of oratory lift an audience as David Lloyd George did. He knew every trick of the business. He knew how to get that audience. He knew how to make them think and how to paint pictures that you could see everything that passed through his brain. His voice was the servant of that brain and it is a voice that drives, that drives all the colour and tone and beauty that is in the human voice.

I see the time is getting on. You didn't touch me, did you? (to the President.) I asked you to.

I am afraid I have kept you a little too long but might I conclude by trying to give you just a slight expression, that is all I can call it, a slight expression as it is coming on to Christmas time, of where that wonderful creation wakes up after the dream in the Christmas Carol. I am doing this because I like the message that poor Old Scrooge gives out afterward. You have got to draw on your imagination a bit because I hope I don't look much like Scrooge at the present time. You will have to imagine that peculiar or rather lovely characterization drawn and he is just waking up after the dream is finished. He looks at the bed posts and the curtains that contain the face of Marley wherever he looks. He looked and the door, when he went to raise the knocker, shone out with Marley's face. Of course, if Scrooge had been drinking you could have excused him but Dickens didn't say anything about it. I believe Scrooge was too mean to have had anything like that, even at Christmas. There he was, lying in that bed with his old night-cap on. All the spirits had gone and he hears the midnight chimes and the Christmas morning comes and in his mumblings and half awakening, you hear him mumble away about the things that have gone through his brain.

"Uh? O-o-h. A Merry Christmas? Who said, 'A Merry Christmas?' If I had my way, every fool that goes about with 'Merry Christmas' on his lips should be boiled with his own pudding, and buried with a stake of holly through his heart. He should.

"There's that clerk of mine, Bob Cratchit, a man with fifteen shillings a week and a wife and family, and talking about a Merry Christmas. Out with him. Away with a lot of them, I say.

"Ah, what's that? Christmas bells? A dream, A dream? I shall live in the past, the present and the future! The spirits of all three shall strive within me.

"Why, yesterday as I went down the street I heard people say, 'Do you know who that man is? That is Scrooge, that grasping miser.' But today, as I walk along I will hear people say. 'Do you know who that man is? That is Scrooge, the benevolent.'

"Heaven and the Christmas time be praised for all this. I say it on my knees, Jacob Marley, I say it on my knees, for from today will dawn the reformation of Ebenezer Scrooge.

"The curtains are not torn down. They are here. I am here. I am as light as a feather, I am as happy as an angel, I am as merry as a schoolboy.

"What's today, you good folks outside? 'What's today? It's Christmas Day,' they said outside. 'It's Christmas Day!' And I haven't missed it. The spirits have done it all in one night. They can do anything they like. Of course they can.

"I know what I'll do. I'll obey the voice of the spirits. I will go and dine with Fred and his wife. I will raise Bob Cratchit's salary. 'A Merry Christmas, Bob! A merrier Christmas, Bob, my good fellow, that I have given you for many a year'."

"God bless the spirits," say I, "And God bless Tiny Tim. God bless the little cripple and make his legs straight, and all you people who sing, may God be with you. A Merry Christmas to everybody, and a Happy New Year to the world, Marley, to the world."

(Hearty applause.)

President: We have enjoyed the recollections of Mr. May who has met many famous people on the stage. We have had a world tour of the British Empire at our luncheon today from a man from the southern hemisphere and a man who has indicated without question his imperial ties and I am sure the imperial ties of all those he represents in that great Dominion. We have had a talk on some of those things surrounding Dickens and his life and Dickens' characters such as is not our good fortune to have frequently. I am sure you all join with me in extending to Mr. May our most sincere thanks for coming and giving us this wonderful interpretation.

OUR PRESENT PERPLEXITIES

An Address by

HON. MR. JUSTICE R. A. E. GREENSHIELDS

Thursday, December 12th, 1935

President: My Lords and Gentlemen: The most famous street or possibly for some of us the most infamous street in Canada bears the name, St. James. This street actually runs some miles in length. The portion, however, referred to in our daily press so frequently consists of only four short blocks. These four short blocks have a rather cosmopolitan atmosphere. We have some very small stores, some small restaurants of the one armed variety and as well, some large banking and other financial buildings. Daily, the so-called fifty bold bad barons, referred to in the fables of steel, wend their way to the counting houses in this street. At its easterly extremity, fortunately, there is placed a large edifice of stone and mortar which prevents it being extended further. As a result Three Rivers, Quebec, and the lower St. Lawrence valley are prevented from being exploited by these buccaneers. Unfortunately for Ontario there is nothing in the form of a barricade at the westerly end of this street and our daily newspapers tell us the result. This citadel to which I refer is the Court of Justice of the City of Montreal. Its Commanding Officer is our guest speaker today, the Honourable Mr. Justice Greenshields, Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Quebec. He is going to talk to us today on "Some of Our Present Perplexities." I think Mr. Justice Greenshields is well known to most Ontario audiences as well as in his own home town. Therefore, I will not dwell on any biography in respect to our guest speaker today. I have very much pleasure in calling upon His Lordship.

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R. A. E. GREENSHIELDS: There are two opening statements I wish to make. The first is that I am deeply grateful to The Empire Club of Canada for the honour done me and the privilege given me in that I may today be actively identified, for a few moments at least, with an interesting weekly luncheon of this, your important and active organization. I am grateful to be with you today.

The second statement I wish to make commends itself for its truth. It is a statement I fancy that it is unnecessary for me to make. The truth of that statement you will readily discover. It is that I am not an after dinner speaker, not even an after luncheon speaker. With all my desire to cultivate such an art I haven't succeeded, and by way of explanation, if not of apology, I might say that the process, during a quarter of a century of actively, very actively, drafting judicial opinions, which by courtesy or misnomer may be called judgments, where it is necessary for exactitude of statement, where words only should be used that will convey a definite significance, I tell you, whether you believe it or not and you may believe it or not as seems to you best, it entirely or practically, or to a great extent at least, destroys the aptitude for after dinner, after luncheon, or any kind of extemporary speaking. So, Gentlemen, I know you are entitled to be critical, but I pray you to be kindly critical, and if I do depart from my usual custom and to some extent at least consult a manuscript, you will, I am sure, pardon me.

Now, Gentlemen, you know when your kind invitation reached me, with that innate, inborn modesty which I have struggled through a fairly long life to cultivate, (My friend here said, 'Overcome') which I have struggled to cultivate without any success whatever, but which with fine ingenuity I have succeeded in concealing from all who meet me, I hesitated to accept that kindly invitation. I assure you, that that hesitation was more apparent than real. It was verily the merest camouflage to conceal an ardent desire to be with you and have you at my mercy for a few moments. (Applause.)

I can best describe my own condition by illustration, in recounting the incident which happened to a very highly respectable Scotsman from north of the Tweed, Mr. MacPherson by name. Like many other Scotsmen and like many others who are not Scotsmen, Mr. MacPherson was very fond of not at infrequent intervals imbibing large portions of his country's native brew. He had a peculiar eccentricity, an alarming eccentricity. Whenever he took a drink he would invariably shut his eyes. A young friend had watched this peculiar operation many times and one day he allowed his curiosity to overcome his good manners and he said, "Mr. MacPherson, will ye no be tellin' me why ye close your eyes before you tak' the drink. Is it a wee prayer you are saying or what is the ceremony?" "No, my boy. No, my boy, it is no' a prayer I'm saying. It is no' a ceremony, but I will tell you. If I saw that whisky before I drank it my mouth would so water that it would spoil my drink." I want to tell you, my mouth watered to have been invited here.

Now, Gentlemen, I am particularly gratified at being with you at this luncheon in this, your Queen City of the West. Many years ago, or as we say in law, at the time beyond which the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, I came to your fair city. I came, I saw, I didn't conquer. I was conquered, but I made an acquisition, I made probably the most valued acquisition that my life has given to me. Strange to say, notwithstanding the passing of many years, notwithstanding the legal spectacular gymnastics indulged in in some of my courts with marriage laws in the Province of Quebec, I am still the proud possessor of what I at that time acquired.

Now, Gentlemen, you know a great wise philosopher, I don't know his name and I never knew his Greek, but he did say that there was nothing just so bad in this world as was expected and there was nothing so good in this world as was anticipated and he added, "The loftiest pine tree never reached the sky and no man's beard ever grew to the ground." Now, then, don't be disappointed, it won't be as bad as you expect it to be and it couldn't be much worse, I am sure.

I was cheered and I was comforted when I accepted the invitation to be with you today and on consulting a dear friend of mine, or not consulting him but conveying to him the information that I was to speak before your Club—a friend for whose opinion I have the highest respect—I said to him, "I am going to offer an address, a halting, feeble, stumbling address to the Empire Club of Canada at Toronto." I read what he said: "I look upon The Empire Club of Canada at Toronto as perhaps the best audience from your point of view and from mine in Canada. Its members are educated, cultivated, cultured men who can appreciate real discussion but who also respond to that lighter touch which only cultured men dare employ or value."

Now, I was comforted. My diffidence, my apprehension, perhaps, was lessened although it was somewhat increased when I realized that the place I am now trying to fill, the task I am now attempting to discharge has been filled and discharged in the past by eminent men whom I cannot hope to emulate or rival in any way.

Now I have a word to say of you and to you and to your Club. I congratulate you most heartily on the name you have given to this, your organization. I know something of what your Club has done in the past. I know something of what your Club is doing and I am confident of what your Club in the future will do. I know that you will, by your precept and by your practice maintain the very highest and best traditions of the British Empire and of the great Anglo-Saxon race. (Applause.)

Our Commonwealth of Nations presents a picture of a vast organization, political, economic, social, religious, an organization unrivalled, unparalleled in the recorded history of this world. Even the Holy Roman Empire, the great Roman Empire in its time, with all its ramifications, with all its then far-flung possessions fell far short of ours. Citizenship in that great Empire was sometimes a matter of heritage, sometimes it was dearly bought, but it ever was a valuable asset and it ever was a safeguard for liberty, such liberty as then existed. St. Paul knew whereof he spoke and knew well what he was doing when he claimed his Roman citizenship. His declaration called forth from the Roman centurian the words, "Take heed what thou doest for this man is a Roman citizen."

A Bombay policeman put it in another way but with equal emphasis and he disclosed the respect in which British citizenship is held. Being asked if he believed in the existence of a God, he said, "I am at the moment unable to say with any certainty but this thing I do say with certainty, from what I know and what I have heard if there be a God he certainly is an Englishman."

We are today in the enjoyment of a heritage of a great past and in very truth it behooves us to hold high the torch, well lighted, jealously, devotedly, to guard the noble ideals which are our priceless inheritance. We must strive with unceasing heart to keep pure and unsullied the fair name and the good name of our beloved Empire. Let us unitedly work in that Empire upon which the sun never sets, that the Empire in the future as in the past, and notwithstanding the predictions of dictatorships, of the Italian dictator, may in the future and forever be a mighty current making for righteousness in this greatly upset, perplexed, chaotic and wearied old world. (Applause.) Never in the history of the Royal family of England was there witnessed such an outburst of wide-spread and universal, loving, affectionate devotion, devoted loyalty, as was evident on the 6th day of May last and the succeeding days. It all was inspired by the fact that His Most Gracious Majesty, our beloved King, was securely seated on the throne of his forefathers at the end of twenty-five years of more or less—probably more—very troublous times. And that unswerving loyalty and devotion to the person of a wise, good King and to his Crown has maintained our Empire secure and steadfast amid all the world-wide chaos and turmoil. Sure and steadfast stands England's Crown, while other crowns may totter and crumble.

But, now, Gentlemen, for a few moments only, to my subject, "Present Perplexities." I fancy you will agree with me that I had not very far to go to find one at least. I might start with myself but I won't. If, indeed, I were to give even a passing notice to the many perplexities I could discover on the very short journey, I would trespass on your attention and on your patience and very soon exhaust the time which your President so wisely circumscribed for me. Perhaps the greatest, and you will pardon me if I stick somewhat to my manuscript because I feel what I say, perhaps the greatest and most outstanding perplexity that faces mankind at this moment and which is apparent to the most superficial observer of today, is that chaotic condition in which we find this world's affairs. There have been in the past many alarming and disturbing crises in the history of many individual states and countries. Fortunately, in the past these crises have been largely restricted to particular countries or nations. The present condition is practically if not actually world wide. It is not my intention to attempt to discover the cause of the present ghastly condition in which his old world finds itself, nor much less is it my intention for a moment to suggest something in the way of a remedy. It is true, it is lamentably true, that the world granaries are filled to the roof with food, yet thousands are faced with almost starvation. Seed time and harvest have never failed, yet penury and want stalk throughout our land. The Great Giver of all Good has given to His world in abundance, to feed and clothe His people, yet thousands lack proper food and many lack proper raiment. All this seems so utterly impossible of explanation that it is not to be wondered at that the greatest intellects of our time stand utterly aghast, completely helpless to bring about the remedy. I am not at the moment making a practical suggestion by way of remedial legislation. The greatest economists of our day wallow in words, stifle themselves with words they little understand. Trained political exponents dream dreams of a world restored to prosperity, yet chaos and confusion worse confounded still prevail. We are faced with a disturbing, perplexing uncertainty. Apart entirely from a financial question which is facing this and other countries, we have industrial difficulties, the problem of unemployment, the fact that an enormous portion of our youth and even of our adults are walking the streets without work, the fact that we have, perhaps, truly lost a whole generation. All these are pressing heavily and call loudly for a remedy, if one can be found. To the most superficial observer of this our day and age it must be clear we are coming to a new synthesis of men and nations. Since the dawn of the present century mighty cataclysmic forces have been released, factors having the most far-reaching and transforming influence upon life and thought. Monotonous as it may be, commonplace as it undoubtedly is, I do say our age is pre-eminently a transition period. We are passing from an old order, known and definite, to a new order, dim and uncertain. I venture to say and I say it with all respect, with all due respect and without confining my statement to my own country, the field of action today is conspicuously lacking—and what I say has been said in another form by others—in leadership that interprets the moral and social needs of our time with brave, clear, definitely determined policies with truth as their basis and wide human well-being as their aim. Loud-speaking reactionaries and subtle masters in compromise are oftener heard and indeed listened to with more attention than accredited leaders in whom the aspirations of mankind find expression. If this be true, I believe it is due largely to the fact that the monstrous, stupendous task of the moment, the pressing, perplexing problems of the future are so overwhelming that human wisdom fails before them and the mottoes of the past seem to offer little guidance and less assistance. The world we face today in very truth is not the world of fifty years ago. In every department of the world's work new situations have arisen, doctrines long accredited, political policies, systems, long accepted as perhaps unchallengable have had their sanctions challenged and their very foundations shaken. Ideals, lofty ideals, it is true, brighten the outlook sometimes with fitful gleam, but the ways are new and human nature is stubborn. Great dissatisfaction, great unrest disturbs the mind of man rather than encouraging hope to brighten. Such, indeed, is the situation as I see it in part at least today. It can only be changed for the better by men equipped with newer weapons of mind, heart and soul, rather than those who put their trust in the ancient armour of long since by-gone battles.

A severe critic, an aggressive censor of modern life, the Gloomy Dean, a charming man, offers the suggestion that the world failure in the crisis of today is more intellectual than moral. Perhaps he might acquit us of moral fall but most assuredly he would convict us of monumental stupidity. Would he not say we are more stupid than bad, we blunder more than we sin.

We stand today as it were, there is no doubt, on the shoulders of our forefathers. We are the legatees of all the past ages. For this reason, if for no other, our vision should be more far-reaching than theirs. We should see farther than they saw. We have their experience as a guiding lesson. That lesson should teach us to improve on their achievement and to avoid their fatal mistakes. We may not be much better than those who have gone before but if modern universities, libraries, laboratories and work shops are any good, if improved opportunity of learning stands for anything, we ought to be able to better avoid the pitfalls of the past.

There is one thing certain, Democracy has come to stay. Whether it is fortunate or otherwise, I will not pause to discuss. It is with us and it will *probably* stay. No, I am not so certain of the last statement but I am certain of this, it thrusts upon each one of us the obligation to most seriously consider, most carefully determine how that democratic power may be best used, for the saying is trite but true, that the possession of a privilege always and ever carries with it a great responsibility in the exercise of that valued, privileged possession. It behooves every one of us to ask ourselves how best we can fulfill the obligation resting upon us and thrust upon us in our democratic community. It is a solemn duty that we must fulfill. We must discharge it and it can only be rightly discharged when each one of us takes a keen, thoughtful, unselfish interest in everything that affects the welfare of the world. Public opinion is all powerful and each one of us, not only by the thoughts expressed but by the example we set, is forming or helping to form public opinion. Therefore, Gentlemen, never forget the power of individual example and of individual influence.

With all humility and with a spirit, critical it may be but most kindly critical, I say that today we have in our midst a class, and perhaps an ever growing class, growing in numbers at least, whom, for lack of a better word I will describe as the indifferent citizen. They are those self-satisfied, those complacent persons who, buried deep in the gratification of their own enjoyment and desires are impervious to any appeal for sympathy, service or sacrifice. They do not think, they do not care. Things are bad and they know it, but they will not put forth the slightest effort wth a view to mending them. They want to be left alone and not to be bothered. Apathy, indifference, preoccupation with, absorption in their own selfish interests are the marks of the indifferent, selfish citizen. Irresponsible agitators are bad enough, Heaven knows, and in all conscience when misguided, but they are far preferable, in my opinion at least, to the man who never thinks about anything saving what touches his own personality, who lives in the little world of his own comfort and who regards earth-shaking events merely as disturbing elements in his own peace and pleasure. He has no eyes to see the signs of the times. He has no heart to feel the woes of the world. He cannot and does not read the writing on the wall or foresee consequences. Yet this man is one of the many electors of this great land who chooses the government for the time being. He it is who influences and sometimes may even control events. He and his like secure the rulers to direct the affairs of the world and largely if not entirely determine its destiny, but save for a brief time in the excitement of an election, when the emotions and inspirations are at their flood tide and common sense and reason and judgment at their lowest ebb, does he ever give a thought to the importance and significance of things, the right or wrong of government policy. Not a thought does he give to the obligation and the task of citizenship.

Now do not, Gentlemen, I beg of you, I beg of you most sincerely, think that what I say is empty democratic rant and an expression of the hater of popular rule. Far from it. Even the most whole-hearted believer in government of the people, by the people and for the people must know that a foolish, selfish, unthinking democracy may be as dangerous to the public weal as any oligarchy, however harsh or false it may be. In all places of the community there is today a most desperate need for an earnest and eager concern with the problems and perils that beset us. Whatever our station in life may be it behooves us to think well, to well consider, to carefully study, to bring the whole power of a well-informed, well-trained, unprejudiced and unbiased mind to bear upon the many perplexing and bewildering questions that confront us today. In policies of government, in religion, in industrial problems, in social relations, in foreign relations, in fact in everything that belongs to human life and the great ordering and the proper ordering of that life, you and I ought to think seriously, persistently, unselfishly, how the best is to be made of this old world in which we live. With this world to all appearances apparently a wreck, you and I have much to do in the short time left, or in the time left to us however short it may be for some of us. We have to work to redeem it from destruction, to restore it along lines of strength, sanity and sanctity. We must gird ourselves well, first and foremost for the task of rebuilding the broken walls of a shattered civilization. We must take no part in the ignoble conspiracy of shutting eyes to the ghastly, chaotic state by which we are surrounded. Think, study, work for the saving of men and women from their tragic wrongs and their bitter sorrows. Travail in thought until a better world is born.

Now, Gentlemen, that is about all I am going to say on perplexities, and I haven't said anything. But in lighter mood and with the permission of your Chairman, I want to read something—it will only take two minutes. You know, "Age loves through ways of olden days with
Memory's lamp to grope;
"While proud youth peers at future years, led
by the torch of hope."
I like the lamp of memory and I will go back to an occasion.

It was the day after one of the banquets at which the Inns of Court entertained the visiting lawyers on the occasion of the historic meeting of the American Bar Association in London. A friendly group at luncheon one day with a distinguished English barrister discussed the relative merits of the orators who had proposed and replied to the various toasts on a preceding evening. One of our fellow guests, a lawyer from St. Paul, Minnesota, boasted that the American representative had on that occasion outshone in eloquence all his rivals. He said in part, "Your English lawyers, while they have a fine command of language, pleasant and well modulated voices and a masterly command of their subject, yet lack that fervour, that snap and that fluent and flowery eloquence, that enthusiastic eloquence which characterizes the oratory of the members of the American Bar." An English barrister seated beside me carefully placed his eye glasses on his nose, looked across the table and addressed the enthusiastic American somewhat as follows:

"Yes, Mr. Brown, I heartily concur with you in your very apt comparison for I have had occasion to note the special feature of American forensic eloquence to which you refer. Some years ago I happened to be in North Dakota and as I was interested in the administration of justice in your great country, I took advantage of an opportunity to attend a murder trial. The proceedings, as I remember, commenced on a Thursday. They lasted all day Thursday, all day Friday and all day Saturday. On Saturday in the evening the Court adjourned until Monday. All Saturday night, all day Sunday and all Sunday night, the Judge, the Jury, the Sheriff and the prisoner played poker together. The trial was resumed on Monday, a verdict of guilty was rendered, and the Judge who was one of the most brilliant exponents of the eloquence to which, Mr. Brown, you have referred, addressed the prisoner as follows: "Prisoner, at the Bar: You have had a fair trial by your peers and you have been found guilty of the heinous crime of murder.

"This lovely season of the year, when the hillsides about us are robed in the garments of living green and the little streams that take their rise in the crystal springs of the mountains flow and flow down through our valleys to mingle their limpid and unsullied waters with the mighty current of the rushing river, this lovely season of spring will give place to sunny, smiling summer, when the husband will till his field with sure confidence in the bountiful co-operation of Nature and will call in melodious accents to his weary but willing steeds as they draw the plough through the rich furrows of a generous soil.

"Summer in turn will give place to the glorious autumn, when our forests are painted a thousand variegated hues and colours and when the happy husbandman will reap the reward of his labours and will contemplate with pride and satisfaction his barns and granaries bursting with plenty.

"Then will come the quiet season of winter, when the blanket of untrodden snow is spread over our sleeping fields and meadows and the lakes and the streams, and the rushing rivers then lie imprisoned in strong fetters of ice.

"Then once more in due course will return the lovely season of Spring, but you, you damned degenerate, you won't be here. You will be hanged tomorrow morning." (Laughter and prolonged applause.)

PRESIDENT: My Lords and Gentlemen: May I thank His Lordship first for his very kind words when referring to this Club. It is hard to say whether in his lighter vein or in that vein when he discussed so seriously our responsibility as individuals, he created the greater influence with us. This, I think, has been really a memorable occasion for this Club. I am particularly pleased that His Lordship has referred in such strong language to our ties in the British Empire and to our responsibility in keeping those ties intact. Your Lordship, on behalf of all those who have listened to you today I wish to extend to you our very hearty thanks.

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF MY STAY IN ENGLAND

AN ADDRESS BY HON. G. HOWARD FERGUSON

Thursday, December 19th, 1935

PRESIDENT: Honourable Mr. Ferguson, Guests and Members of The Empire Club of Canada: I was somewhat concerned on reading Monday papers to note the tenor of the interviews which the press had with the Honourable Mr. Ferguson. It seemed as though he wished the public to think of him in the words of the song which goes as follows: "The Old Gray Mare, She Ain't so Bad as She Was in The Old Days." (Laughter.) Perhaps I had better say that again: "She Ain't What She Always Was." I had the good fortune yesterday to spend some little time with our guest speaker and I can assure you there is no need for us being concerned in that regard. (Applause.) Mr. Ferguson is still the same strong man he was when he lived here five years ago. His mind has lost none of its keenness. With the years he grows and improves and he still retains that very happy faculty of being very human and being much concerned with the problems of those in distress.

I haven't any doubt during the past five years that Mr. Ferguson's perspective has broadened materially. He has had contacts during that time which we have the opportunity to get only on very unusual occasions. He has been mingling with people who realize that what we do today means not only something with respect to the immediate present but what we do today will mean much to us in the years to come. Mr. Ferguson, during this past five years has carried a very heavy load. As High Commissioner for Canada he has accepted very heavy responsibilities and we, as members of the Empire Club wish to say to him that as good Canadians we are very appreciative of his efforts. We welcome him back to Canada and we welcome him once more as an active member of this organization. Mr. Ferguson. (The audience arose to its feet and greeted Mr. Ferguson with cheers and prolonged applause.)

HON. G. HOWARD FERGUSON: The old gray mare may not be what she used to be, but you have to try her out to find out. (Laughter.)

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I feel that you have paid me a very great compliment in asking me to be your guest at this luncheon and giving me the opportunity to discuss very briefly with you some phases of my work and my experience in the last five years that have impressed me tremendously.

To come home is a great thing. There is no more comforting and no more thrilling word in the English language than the word 'home.' (Applause.) Even if you do come as a prodigal, it is nice to get back home.

I thought that today I might like to touch upon two or three features of English life and the general British situation that will be of interest to you. It must of necessity be very brief because the field is so broad and the problems so inexhaustible that one cannot, even devoting a whole evening, impart sufficient information to give an adequate conception of what the situation is.

The three features that I have in mind are the position Britain has taken and the course she has pursued with regard to military activity. Another feature that is most remarkable is her recovery and progress in industry and commerce. And the third and perhaps the most fundamental of all her characteristics is her unswerving devotion to the institutions that form the basis of our social and political order.

Throughout the ages Great Britain has always been regarded as the symbol of justice and fair play. Even in the days when she went out to expand her borders in new countries and to develop colonies she endeavoured to do it on a basis of fairness and justice, protecting all the rights of those with whom she was dealing. As she has pursued that course all down through the ages and every Britisher today, whether he comes from Scotland, the north of England or Whitechapel is inoculated with that spirit and that principle of fair play. She is regarded as the guarantor of peace and her actions have amply justified that title. It was said after the last war that we fought that awful carnage to put an end to conflicts by force of arms and Britain followed the principle that underlies the effort made by a combination of nations into a League. She put forth her best efforts to secure world disarmament. Well, I needn't elaborate on what happened. As you know she reduced not only her offensive portions, if you can say she has such, but all her defences to a point where even the phlegmatic Britisher began to be nervous because nobody else was following her example. She sacrificed tremendously in the interests of humanity, thinking that other nations would live up to the principles they enunciated and would follow her example, but their actions, I think, demonstrate to us all that the old vicious philosophy of force is still too wide spread and rampant in this world, and Britain has been placed in the position where if she is to maintain her own defences and to protect the commerce of the Empire, not only from Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, but from Canada as well, if she is to see to it that the business we want to do with the rest of the world, we will be permitted to do, she has got to strengthen and increase her naval police force, whether we contribute to it or not.

And may I say incidentally, that in this last election in great Britain, one of the outstanding features was the defence policy as enunciated by Mr. Baldwin and by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That did a tremendous lot to give this government a huge majority because people there have accepted the view of the government that they have made all the sacrifices necessary to try and urge others to throw down their arms and pursue more neighbourly and peaceful methods and they have found that that way has failed.

Now, there is only one other way outside of a clash of arms and that is to secure the co-operation of the nations of the world to prevent an aggressive action, to prevent invasion, imposition, and Great Britain having joined the League of Nations, not of her origin, having adopted another fellow's child, she proposes to see that that child has just the same chance as her own child would have. Having signed an obligation with her traditional character she proposes to keep that obligation and her position at the League today and ever since she joined it has been, "we signed a covenant, we promised to do something; as long as it is possible to carry out our undertaking we propose to do it." (Applause.) And that's what I say, incidentally, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, is one of the things that has made Great Britain great. She keeps her word. But the word in the Covenant provides not for individual isolated action but it provides for collective action, and when collective action becomes impossible—I cannot see anything else than a dissolution of the League because it is not a League unless it acts in co-operation—and today Britain has the most difficult task, and we who live so far away from the centre of this intricate situation should withold our criticism, should give sympathetic voice to the great nation which is trying to extricate the world from the gravest situation it has been in since 1914.

Marvellous people. I went away from here with fairly strong views with regard to the wisdom of our maintaining our imperial connection, and a fairly high opinion of the British as a people. I have come back convinced that the future security and peace and prosperity of the world depends upon the actions that take place in those little Islands in the North Sea. And as a humble Canadian so far as my voice and influence is concerned, I will be guided by the experiences I have had, the convictions that have come to me as a result of what activity I have had, what contacts I have had there and what I understand of the situation.

We signed the League Covenant, too. "Canada" is writ large right across the bottom. A promissory note. You can't escape it any more than you can escape from the bank, as long as you have any assets. We have undertaken by every proper means, collectively with other nations in the world, to do all in our power to restrain armed conflict and I am sure we will do it. I am sure we will stand by Britain who has stood by us through the centuries. (Applause.) I am sure that it will be the part of wisdom that we should do so.

You know, they are a remarkable people. I heard the Foreign Secretary, Sir Samuel Hoare, make a most remarkable speech at Geneva. I never heard anything more eloquent and inspiring and convincing in my life and as things have gone on, apparently in his desire to go the very limit to secure protection of his country, he enunciated a policy that the British people didn't approve. Now, what happened? They tell Samuel Hoare very emphatically and he does what every loyal citizen and Minister of Government does do, he gives them his resignation, because he doesn't expect them all to resign and let him run the job. He believes in solidarity of Cabinet action, (Applause.) which is the very basis of British institutions and he walks away. He says somebody else may do better and there is no recrimination and there is no attack upon the other fellows and there is no attempt to destroy the government of which he was a member. No, they don't do it that way over there. They have their own peculiar methods of doing things and their record through the centuries has shown they are pretty good methods, too.

Now, I musn't say anything more about the war situation. It is tense, it is difficult. We should avoid, as I said a while ago, even suggested criticism that will give the opponents of Britain what they are looking for, an opportunity of saying that the Commonwealth Nations are not united behind Great Britain. They seek every opportunity to do that and in certain sections of the

European press every advantage is taken of any opportunity. I used to spell it out in my limping French, far into the night, the criticisms that came from some of these people who believe that the British nation is trying to dominate the world for selfish purposes.

Another feature, that you know more about than I do, of the British development of the last few years is her remarkable recovery, industrially, commercially and financially, away ahead of anything else in the world. Now, how did that happen? When the depression hit her hardest and it did hit her hard, millions of industrial workers walked the streets. You remember, Britain decided that the man who had given up his work, his employment, providing for his wife, to go to war and defend the country should be taken care of when he came back and they devised an unemployment insurance or relief scheme which is called the Dole. They call it the Dole when it is abused, and that is pretty often, but unemployment insurance when it is well observed. The principle is sound. The difficulty is in the details of working it out. Britain, instead of devising codes, fixing standards, wages and hours and living conditions by which to regulate trade, as some other countries did, realized that you ought to get some business before you begin to regulate. There is no object in setting up a great organization if it has nothing to do except create agitation and friction and dissatisfaction, and the old British fellow said, "The first thing for us to do is to re-establish our credit in the world, to get back the confidence which the world has been placing in us for years and the way to do that is to show them we can live within our income, that we are not wasteful or extravagant. In other words, we must balance our budget. We must keep our public expenditures within our revenues," and they did that. And while others were building a house from the roof down they began to build a structure from the foundation up. When she got her budget balanced she knew what would happen. In every country where uncertainty, dissatisfaction and jeopardy existed for investment and money and all the rest of it, they all began by overhead and underground and every other devious method to bring their money to London, because they said, "There are a people that are carrying on their business thriftily and on sound lines," and the Englishman got what he was after. He got more money than he knew what to do with in London in a very little while. With what result? Why they are worse than you are, the bankers there. They won't pay you anything at all for deposits over there, they have so much money. The result is that money goes out and looks for an opportunity to earn something for the man who owns it and it goes into building, it goes into industrial opportunity, it goes into every phase of business activity, looking for a chance to earn something for the man to whom it belongs. What is the result? The wheels begin to turn, the shop-keepers see the revenue come in, the payrolls are increased, until today they have a million more people working in England than there ever were in her history. (Applause.) Yet, she has a couple of million people unemployed; perhaps to put it fairly, I think a little over a million unemployed, the others are unemployable for one reason and another. And this condition even with the unemployed would not exist except for the reason that there has been no migration. Before the war she sent away a quarter of a million, sometimes far more than that, annually. During the war of course the great casualty lists cut off the annual supply at about the same rate. Since that time there has been nothing but an accumulation of people and her efforts to find new employment with all the world competition against her, including Czechoslovakia and Japan and these places that can produce so much cheaper, she has increased the payroll to the extent of about a million workers. That is a record that is unparalleled in the world and it is due to what? It is due to the genius of a well-balanced judgment of what we sometimes call phlegmatic, stupid

Englishmen. That is the sort of people they are. They make no fuss about these things and those of you who have had an opportunity of coming in contact with them and doing business with them, I am sure will endorse what I say.

I, as High Commissioner, was a sort of glorified sales agent for Canada and I went about a good deal to places like Birmingham, Manchester and Sheffield and so on and I have been in a lot of them recently. You know in Sheffield they couldn't get men enough. In Birmingham the situation is about the same. A tremendous change in the whole situation in a few years. She is leading the world again, financially, industrially and commercially and will continue to do so. (Applause.) That is the reason I think that we should cling to the opportunity there is for us over there, that we should cultivate contacts, improve our relations, interpret one to another our peculiar situations and try and wipe out the differences that create friction.

Now, I felt that was my job over there, to go about and sell Canada to Great Britain and sell Britain's goods to this country because it is only in that way that we are ever going to consolidate the whole imperial organization. As a matter of fact my job was to contribute what I could to annihilate the 3,000 miles of ocean that lies between here and Great Britain by promoting trips across, encouraging trade and business. That has been my job and that is what I tried to do.

Now, there is just one other thing that I think is fundamental to the existence and success of any country, particularly a country that is imbued and inspired by the ideals that underly British life and British citizenship. This year, as you know, the 25th anniversary of the accession of King George was celebrated and it was celebrated by everybody. One cannot conceive, no matter what you heard over the wires here, those who had the good fortune to be there during that time, as I was, will understand when I say that people at home couldn't conceive of the warmth and enthusiasm of affection for the monarch and his family that was displayed on that occasion.

Can you imagine 500,000 people standing nearly all night at your front door to see you come out? I never had as many as that. (Laughter.) They stood all night. We lived where we overlooked St. James Park and the King, to give the poorer people full opportunity of enjoying that marvellous pageant and demonstration, ordered that all the parks should be opened all night and he had the police arrange that there should be no vehicular traffic within a mile, a large radius anyway, the idea being that these people who came from away down in the east end wouldn't be run over and killed by motor cars, perhaps, and could sleep out in the open in the parks. Tens of thousands of them did. We looked out of our windows and saw them sleeping there, newspapers over them, a little bag of lunch with them. All were waiting to see the King and Queen in the morning. Nothing has ever occurred like it in the world and all so good-natured.

It reminded me of an incident a short time before that. The King and Queen went down to lay the corner stone of the new King College in Rosebery, and going out of my office door with one of the European Ambassadors from a very important country, we stopped to look at the little pageant. There were two carriages, a dozen out-riders and a couple of policemen on motorcycles ahead, but it is a British sight. I said to him, "Your Excellency" (because we call one another "Your Excellency" over there, don't forget that) I said, "Your Excellency, I like that sort of thing." He said, "I love it. That is the life blood of this country. That is what keeps this country going. There is no place in the world except one other country that I know of where the monarch can ride through the streets in an open carriage without a soldier anywhere near." A tribute to the steadiness of the Britisher and his loyalty.

Now, that pervaded all through that great demonstration that went on for so long. Policemen held their hands together to keep the crowd back. I remember we were going down to St. Paul's, my wife and I were privileged to go there, and the procession was halted every here and there and there were tens of thousands of people jammed in on the sides of the street, and of course the crowd would surge back and forth. This is just an example of the way they treat the crowd. A big fat policeman was pushed a bit, he looked around and here was a group of women. He said, "Get up there, Mary, I'll step on your toes if you don't." That has quite a different effect from saying, "Here you, get back there." The whole thing was so good natured and was such an enthusiastic acclaim of affection everywhere.

You know the King laid out four official drives, north, south, east and west, with all the pageantry, because the Britisher loves pageantry. So do I. Mysticism is the greatest influence in the world and the mysticism that surrounds monarchy and all the old traditional institutions creates an atmosphere that has a wonderful effect. I confess I am inoculated with it. The King as I say, started driving about and the people were so enthusiastic everywhere they could scarcely get through and then with the great human heart that he has he said, "There are back streets and byways that don't see this procession," and as an Englishman he said to the Queen, "Mary,, we must have a drive over to Camberwell," and they drove over there. With nothing but their motor car and two or three men with them, they came to the end of a little street all decorated with coloured paper; all had signs, even the poorest people. The King was greatly taken with a banner up across the front of this little narrow street and on that banner was in rough printing: "Lousy, but Loyal." (Laughter.) I didn't credit that story but I asked some newspaper fellows and they said it was likely the truth. They went over to see for themselves and it was actually true.

Again, I say, you don't see such things as that in any other country in the world. The affection for the King, for the Monarchy, is marvellous, really.

I remember during the strike—I told you (The President) I wouldn't tell a story at all—but I remember when the boys and girls and the students drove the trams and busses and all that sort of thing. Nobody interfered with them. Everybody laughed at them and a friend from across the line was over there and he, with some others, was watching the movements around the strike. Just then the King drove down the Mall, the street that comes down from the palace. Of course everybody takes his hat off and there was a little group, obviously workers on strike and the American friend said, "Why, that is funny. Those fellows look like strikers. Why should they take off their hats to the King?" I said, "Let us go over and ask them." We went over and they said, "Yes, we are strikers, we are bus drivers and tram drivers." The American said, "Why should you take off your hat to the King when you are striking against the very conditions that create this thing?" A little fellow looked up at him and said, "Why, you bloke, that's the King." That is the spirit that exists all through that country, all over the British Isles.

Now, the demonstration showed two or three things—and I am finished. In the first place, as I said, it showed an affectionate devotion to the Sovereign and the Royal family, I suppose unparalleled anywhere in the world, I am sure unparalleled in the world. It was an emphatic declaration as was amply proven by the recent election that all the modern nostrums like Fascism and Bolshevism and the other isms can't find any root in the soil of Britain. (Applause.) There is a handful of them and of course the smaller the dog is the more he barks.

Second, it showed to my mind a spirit of determination. That was the universal idea, that the institutions that have guaranteed liberty and security to the world and have weathered the storm of vicissitude and turbulence all over the world, that today give leadership to world opinions, are institutions worth while preserving and will live longer than you and I can look into the future, or our children or our children's children, with all British people enjoying the blessings of monarchical government on a representative system such as we enjoy in this country today. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT: After hearing Mr. Ferguson today one could not help but be proud of his citizenship in the British Empire. One could not help but be proud of those people in the Old Land who have done so much during the past few years to keep this old world out of chaos and one could not help but be proud of having as our representative in the Old Land, Mr. Ferguson during these trying times.

I am sure I am expressing on your behalf our very sincere thanks for this remarkable message that he has brought to us. Shortly Mr. and Mrs. Ferguson are leaving Toronto. They are going to spend their Christmas back at the old home, back with the old home friends and I know I am expressing your thoughts when I extend to Mr. Ferguson our Best Wishes for a Merry Christmas and a very Happy New Year. (Applause.)

AN UNOFFICIAL FRENCHMAN'S VIEW OF THE EUROPEAN SITUATION

AN ADDRESS BY
PROFESSOR FERNAND BALDENSPERGER

Thursday, January 9th, 1936

MR. BRACE: In February, 1918, just about the time that President Wilson was telling us that this was the war that was going to end all wars, the guest at this Club was Captain Baldensperger, an officer in the French Army. His visit again, this year, is merely an interlude in the life of a great internationally known scholar. He has spent all his years in the field of scholarship and is known in every civilized country. It was he who put the study of Comparative Literature on a secure basis and he remains, I understand, the leading scholar in that field. He has published almost innumerable pamphlets and books on that subject and organized and was Editor-in-Chief of the "Review of Comparative Literature." Until recent months he was Professor of Comparative Literature in the University of Paris. Since October last he occupies a similar Chair in Harvard University. For many years he has had the advantage of knowing intimately many of the public men of France, including the present President of the Republic, Premier Laval and many former Premiers.

Unlike the last occasion he does not come to us in an official capacity and therefore probably will be able to speak his own mind more than was the case when he was wearing the French uniform. Today he is going to address us on the subject, "An Unofficial Frenchman's View of The European Situation."

PROFESSOR FERNAND BALDENSPERGER: Mr. President, Monsieur Rochereau, Dr. Cody, Gentlemen: I am grateful for the introduction given me, pointing out that as a French officer I was here seventeen years ago. I wonder whether any of you remember as I do the horizon blue uniform of those days and recall the fact that at the same time the Italian Military Attaché at Washington had been a guest of the Club as well and had insisted in his speech here on something he was not at all willing to say to President Wilson in Washington, namely that Italy wanted to push her borders to Fiume, which was supposed, according to President Wilson's view, to be a city under mandate, internationalized and not belonging either to Italy or to Jugoslavia.

This is a point I remember because it shows that, even in those days, there were differences which a League of Nations was not able to arbitrate.

I have known quite a number of people prominent in politics from Monsieur Lebrun, President of the Republic, who was a young engineer at Nancy at the time that I had my own training, down to the smaller fry of politics, but embracing, also, people like Herriot, a former school-mate of mine whose coming to Toronto brought him to places of interest, I trust, and Daladier, who was once a student of mine.

So if you think of the personal experiences likely to be involved, Comparative Literature is not necessarily the stale study you might imagine it to be. It is as living as anything can be because its real interest is to discover to what extent different countries have different mentalities and different points of view, and have succeeded in the present as well as in the past in borrowing from or lending to each other.

I might mention that I have spent considerable time in England, in Germany, in Italy, in Brazil. I have been in Belgium, in Poland, in Scandinavia. I have spent several years in the United States. My last visit was to Finland, the only country, by the way, which is paying its debt to the United States, and it is the poorest of all countries. To begin with they have hardly any resources but wood and stone. How can you live on wood and stone? By making paper plates, pulp, cellulose, and selling them. I was present when they laid the first stone of their new University after having completed new Parliament buildings. Right beside them is the immense Soviet Empire, yet they seemed not to be afraid at all. They faced the question of revenues about twenty years ago. Wages were very uneven in their country. On one side of them the Russian was working for nothing. The Finnish worker was willing to accept a very small wage. Now Finland is a well-balanced country in every respect and, as I said, is paying her debt to the United States, to the United States with her three billion debt.

These by-ways through which I have passed have, of course, given me certain ideas which may be correct or not but they have been given me by the spectacle of events, and a man now dead, Georges Clemenceau, may in his retired life have helped me to see more clearly the issues of the past and the present. I think there is nothing so great as a man who has been a powerful political figure and, having absolutely retired, does not read a newspaper. Clemenceau used to say, "I have made newspapers. I know how they are made. There are two kinds of news. There is news so important that everybody knows it, and there is news so unimportant that everybody has to forget it. So I do not read newspapers at all."

Well, Clemenceau's doctrine was one that is very pleasant to recall in the present circumstances. It was that France and England are animated fundamentally by the some ideas—Order and Liberty and Order with Liberty—ideas which I think make the wealth of civilization. He dreaded lest England and France be separated by transitory issues or by interests and ideas which seem divergent, but he maintained that those divergencies must not make Englishmen and Frenchmen forget that theirs is a common cause. Thirty-five years ago he was afraid that

Protestant England might not understand Catholic France in the question of the separation of Church and State in France.

He bequeathed these apprehensions in some sort to the French people many of whom, like Clemenceau, are rather indifferent to the League of Nations. "Yes," said Clemenceau, "I believe in the League but it must have a police force." It has been, as you know, a part of French policy concerning the League that it should have force at its disposal, but the organization of this weapon is a very delicate operation. It is very difficult but, after all, if the League is to be anything but a bureaucracy, or as has been said, "a super-state without a state," it must have recourse to something of the kind.

Co-operation between England and France has been, I am sorry to say, hampered by many difficulties. Do you notice that, when something pleasing to the English occurs in co-operation, they use the term Anglo-French? And when it is unpleasant, they say Franco-British? I refer you to the newspaper files. As long as the Hoare-Laval agreement was supposed to be a favourite with the English people they spoke of it as the Anglo-French agreement. As soon as opinion in England was against it, they spoke of Franco-British affairs. I do not believe, after all, that such methods are to your taste.

We, in France, are a continental people. Therefore we know one side of the question. On the other hand, our population is over fifty per cent agricultural. These farmers, or peasants, are very nice peasants, generally speaking. They are very conservative and addicted to a kind of routine which may be a hindrance to a certain kind of progress, but they have made the French nation. They are not greatly impressed by what occurs far from their interests but they are opposed to communism and the holding of property in the Russian style. They know that when a man has tilled his soil he is really entitled to food for his labour. That is ingrained in the French population but at the same time they are opposed to anything like the intervention of too big interests between the community and themselves.

A British diplomat recounts in his Memoirs the story of a conversation held in his house with De Tocqueville, the author of a book called 'Democracy in America.' "I wonder," asked one, "what France means in the general trend of history." "Possibly a kind of lighthouse," said another, "not showing the way but pointing out the rifts, the shoals, the difficulties, not very revolutionary nor reactionary . . . too reasonable, and all the rest." "No," said an Italian refugee, "the story of France is a constant fight against the Middle Ages. France is always afraid of something like the excessive interference of the Church in State affairs, the intervention of some powerful interest between the weak or the small citizen and the State. The French opposed the Seigneurs and remained close friends of the King as long as the Seigneurs were very powerful. When the Crown became too powerful they turned on Royalty itself."

I think there is something fundamental in that statement. It gives you one of the keys to French politics, revealing in Internal affairs the dread of vested interests, which is not exactly the gun-makers, the fear of which is a phobia spreading through democracies, but the idea that manufacturing interests and navigation interests, and iron interests and so on are bound to form a group, with their newspapers and their members of parliament speaking for them. The kind of restlessness shown nowadays by the American Senate has been since the War a steady disquiet in the French mind. The French are not Communists but there are some who would like to have state ownership and state control of many interests now in private hand. Those of us who know what petty officials are in a bureaucracy oppose that trend. We feel that this opposition is ingrained in the general electoral body of France.

This explains, to a certain extent at least, the French idea that, in an age which has not abolished war, a degree of preparedness is necessary. That is how the war was won and why the League of Nations, in its quality as Super-State, occupied itself with the interests of all nations.

So we have to revert once more to the ability of the League to prevent war and my objection, my chief objection to the different Commissions, which I know partly through their representatives and partly by their activities, my chief objection is that the League is really a bureaucracy and seemingly believes that such are its true functions. Nations were restive and so what was needed was administrative work. If you happen to be in Geneva and go to the magnificent building now in process of completion you will find that the Archives are already as full of documents as, let us say, the Library of Congress at Washington; brimful of documents. They have already thousands and thousands of circulars, recommendations on every conceivable subject, on population, on Labour, on window-blinds and so on. Recommendations, recommendations, recommendations, nothing but recommendations. Here, then, were all the national problems that were left for solution, mistakes were banished, everything was ready for co-operation and collaboration.

But, with the idea of collaboration comes the question of the various countries in the League of Nations and the knotty problem presented by the conflict in Ethiopia. I do not know Mussolini, never met him, never saw him. He is admitted to be a very energetic man and has great confidence in his advisors. An American lady had in her house in Florence a portrait of the Dictator. I said "How is it possible for you, belonging to an old Puritan family of New England, to have a Dictator's portrait in your drawing-room? "Oh," she replied, "I had something to ask of him. He gave me ten minutes. In eight he had settled it far more efficiently than any captain of industry in America would have done. Then he said, 'You have two minutes more. What am I to do with those two minites?' I said, 'Just let me admire you.' To which he replied, 'Don't admire me; admire my people who still believe in me. As long as that admiration is behind me I am safe.' And she took out a portrait, he wrote his signature on it and there it is in her drawing-room.

He has changed the Parliamentary system of his country, he has reclaimed hundreds of thousands of acres of unused land, he has built cities and disciplined the people, who now remain in the Peninsula instead of going to South America or North America to be milkmen or ditch-diggers for others. By and by he complained that more room was needed and that gave the key to his enterprise.

Here is an anecdote which Clemenceau did not put into his Memoirs. But he told me the story long before there was any sign of danger. At a meeting of the Big Three, not the Big Four because President Wilson was not there, there were present Orlando for Italy, Clemenceau for France, and two Englishmen, Lloyd George and Balfour. Orlando, addressing Clemenceau said, "After all, Mr. Clemenceau, we Italians have been faithful allies. Our preparedness was not what it should have been and the relations between officers and men were not as effective as possible. We had to have the help of England and France in our difficulties, but we made good on the Piave and other places. Now, you know that an outlet is needed for our population, why not give us Jibuti?" I was in Jibuti for two days. Its railway is said to be the most expensive in the world but Jibuti is not a very enjoyable place with its negroes and its warriors. Clemenceau's reply was, "Yes, but France has a colony in China and needs a coaling station on the way there. So if England will give us a coaling station, I wouldn't mention Aden, but one of less importance, we could give you Jibuti, Mr. Orlando." Thereupon one of the English delegates said, "Why not, if that will bring our difficulties to an end?" Whereupon the other English delegate, plunging his hand into the luxuriant hair of his colleague, retorted, "You forget there are two hundred thousand tons of Welsh coal in Singapore. How can you talk of giving it up to France?" So, Clemenceau turned to Orlando: "You see! Nothing doing." And nothing was done.

Now, Italy has a good memory. And Italy knows what history is. It knows that history is partly unsuccessful enterprise, and certainly in the bitter letter which called for the re-organization of the Italian army, there was certainly the memory of their defeat at Adowa and, at the same time, the idea that they had been frustrated after the War. When the attack on Abyssinia was organized there was another issue, too, in Mussolini's mind which is not very well known in America, nor in Europe either for that matter. That was that a stand must be made in East Africa against the Japanese, who have a very strong foothold in Ethiopia. All the flowing white robes in which you see Ethiopian gentlemen walking about are made in Japan, and there is a continually expanding colony of Japanese on the slopes of Ethiopia. Mussolini's son-in-law was Consul General in Shanghai for eight years and Mussolini is well versed in world politics. But this is a side issue he doesn't care to talk about. He has said, too, that it was the role of Rome in the past to make a stand and it is also her role in the present, for England can not make it with India on her hands, nor France with Indo-China, nor Holland with the Dutch Indies.

All this does not prevent the whole enterprise being a startling breach of agreements among the nations. But why did the League of Nations not take the slightest interest in what Mussolini said in order to arrange things before the outbreak of hostilities? It is about a year now since the first workmen were sent to Ethiopia or Somaliland. Nobody cared. Nobody cared, and when France denounced German armaments they said in Geneva, "Let us wait and see." If the League is to be better than a wait-and-see organization, they ought to have a diplomacy of their own. The League ought to have had before last November something like a real force to watch and to know and to make definite answers to definite questions.

I think when I addressed the Club in 1918, it was on French opinion about a League of Nations, and on the ideas of Henry the Fourth and Queen Elizabeth concerning a Franco-British or an Anglo-French alliance, and I told you also of the work of the Abbé de Saint-Pierre who planned universal peace for 1912. He wrote in 1712, saying that in 1912 something ought to be tried to work out even something better than a counterpart of the fallacy that alliances generally led to war. It was a very fine idea shared by many French diplomatists of the time.

So my point in those days was that this is not a League of any nations but a League of some nations, and it was, unhappily enough, our fault, Italy's and France's, that Ethiopia was brought into the League. England was not very eager but the League, on the recommendation of France and Italy, admitted that Ethiopia was a nation. But you know it is not a nation according to our understanding of the term, not because of a lack of centralization but because of the general attitude of the people. Men say, "Oh, let them alone. They're a quiet folk." Yes, they are quiet, but they quiet their slaves, too. To speak of Ethiopia as a nation goes against the grain of most French people. The word 'nation' is a French word. It was used by the French before any other people and while other peoples were still a combination or mixture of populations. There were covenants between powers and so on, but the French felt the idea of the nation, that is a minimum of covenant relations among those possessing a common past, a common idea, if possible. That is what we call a nation. To assume that any agglomeration of populations having a sovereign constitutes a nation, is repugnant to many French people.

I remember we sent one of our best ambassadors to the United States, Jules Jusserand, and he told me that after the War about sixty tribes or, may I say, populations presented themselves before the French ambassador in Washington demanding to be admitted to the dignity of nationhood. They actually went to Geneva and, knowing of President Wilson, they went with some confidence, but, first, they went to the French Embassy. How is it to be conceived that we would agree that people who spoke no other language than their own and therefore had no real feeling for the outside world would be admitted as nations? Once the real story of the nations at Geneva is told, some very amusing incidents will be revealed.

After all, is it not so easy to be recognized as a nation and Italy does not understand how public opinion in England and elsewhere can resent the revival of Roman Imperial ideas in Italy, and they are furious at the idea that England, so kind to them during the centuries when they were feeble, is embittered against them now that they have secured a strength which is possibly greater in assumption than in reality but which, after all, has given proof of its existence for ten years. They say: "It is so nice to travel in Italy now. The trains start on time and arrive on time. They are not afflicted with the difficulties of the Southern Railway in France, where a Councillor went to the jitney driver and said, "My man, I am very pleased to see you here. Here is a twenty franc piece for you." And the driver said, "Well, I am sorry, but it is for yesterday's train I am here. It is today's train now!" You must not forget that a start on Fascism was made from a liberal point of view.

These external affairs, curiously enough, have a direct bearing on French internal politics. I should not be surprised to see Mr. Laval's government fall in a fortnight or so, because his majority is very small. If he does, it will be because of his presumed favour for Italian peace or Italian victory; and at the same time owing to attacks by people who wish to devaluate the franc. Who will succeed him, I don't know. It may be Herriot, who precipitated a division against Laval in the last sitting. But I do not suppose that my old friend would accept. He is the man when things are beautiful and easy. After the War he said to Clemenceau, "You made war, I make peace." Where is that peace? Where is the certainty of peace? But his Utopia is always fresh and new, but these are not the times for Utopias. I wonder if Daladier is the man to handle the situation, full of foreign as well as internal difficulties. There would be more muddling, possibly 'muddling through,' but certainly muddling.

My hope is that in our time a peaceful issue may be found. Oil sanctions would probably mean war. Then France would be in an awful dilemma. We should not be between two fires but three. For Italy has two frontiers with us, not only in the Alps but in Tunis. England's strengthening of her fortifications in the Mediterranean shows that this eventuality has been considered. At the same time we should have to withdraw part of our garrisons from our eastern and north-eastern frontiers. For years these have been quiet enough, but you know how it is! If people are thinking of opportunities and possibilities, and if they feel prepared, they may try something. The Germans are really technicians. They give great weight to technical arrangements. That is, people in charge of such and such services are asked by the people above if things are ready. And if the answer is 'Yes,' the people above say 'Go ahead.' That is what they may do, if France has to withdraw part of her garrison. I do not believe in the immediate danger of war but in eventualities that may precipitate war.

In conclusion I should like to recall an old nursery anecdote which I heard when I was in England for the first time, and which you may know. The mother said, "Baby, shut that door." "No, mother, I won't shut the door."

"Shut that door, Baby." "No, I won't." "Leave it open then, for I must and will be obeyed." In this way Italy might be given a mandate for the governing and civilizing and modernizing of Ethiopia under the League. With English backing that would be a way to satisfy Italian pride allay French anxieties, and maintain British honour. (Applause.)

Mr. Brace: Professor Baldensperger has carried us over a great deal of territory. He has presented a point of view we seldom would hear from an Anglo-Saxon and the advocates of the League of Nations, I think, in general will say not too much about what has been done by the League in the past but I think we can see the possibility of much being done by the League in the future. On behalf of The Empire Club, I extend to the Professor our very sincere thanks.

IMPACT OF WORLD FORCES IN THE FAR EAST

AN ADDRESS BY MR. JOHN W. BEATON

Thursday, January 16th, 1936

MR. H. C. BOURLIER: Honoured Guest and Gentlemen of The Empire Club: Last week you will recall, it was our good fortune to hear from the lips of a very charming Frenchman his impressions with respect to the position at present occupied by France, Great Britain and Italy. Today, a native born Canadian is going to speak to us on very much the same line, that is to say, the entire relationship of those countries which are directly affected by the constantly changing checkerboard of continental politics.

Before presenting the speaker, I would like to say one or two things about him. I have already told you that he was born in Canada, his birthplace being Chesley. He has been for sixteen years the energetic Metropolitan Secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association at Montreal, and in that connection I might say that we endeavoured to have with us today at the head table certain of the gentlemen who were prominent in the Young Men's Christian Association's current campaign. We have been able to do that to a limited extent, in the persons of Dr. Best and Mr. Frank Waterman, and I think we might include Colonel McGee who is always interested in everything of a good nature in the City, but the majority of those asked found with campaign luncheons and so on that they were unable to be present, but we can identify them with Mr. Beaton in this very excellent enterprise now under way.

Mr. Beaton has been on a six months' trip around the world. He has travelled over 20,000 miles and has made minute observations of conditions in all the major cities, we might say, of Europe and the Orient, and it is out of the fund of his experience so gained that he is going to address us today on the subject: "Impact of World Forces in the Far East." I have much pleasure in presenting Mr. John Beaton.

MR. JOHN W. BEATON: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I should like first of all to acknowledge on my own behalf and on behalf of the Young Men's Christian Association, the honour which you have done me in inviting me to address you today. When one recalls the long line of distinguished speakers who have occupied this place, one's appreciation is quite real and sincere.

As the Chairman has said, I have recently returned from what for me was a most thrilling experience, to completely encircle the globe and to come into contact with some of the great influences which are playing upon the nations of the world today and which, perhaps, have reached a point of tension in the Far East that is not paralleled even in Europe.

My work took me to Japan, China, Korea, Manchuria, and across Siberia to Moscow, into Poland, and to Germany, to Switzerland, and to France, finishing up in Great Britain, where I had an opportunity of meeting some of the leading political figures in the Empire. But one returns to Canada with a very profound impression that great cyclonic forces of Bolshevism and Nationalism and Internationalism are something that must concern the people of Canada. There is, I think existing in the world today a sense of impending tragedy. One feels this in Nanking, the capital of China, as one talks with those brilliant young officials of the Nationalist Government. I recall with a particular sorrow and a sense of personal loss the half day that I had the privilege of spending with His Excellency, Wang Ching-wei, the then Premier of China, who as you know, had an attempt made on his life by way of assassination a few weeks ago and who has since resigned and turned over entirely the leadership of the Government of that great Republic to General Chaing Kai-Shek, who was at that time the military dictator of China and is now the sole dictator of China. But one senses this feeling of tragedy, too, in Japan, as one realizes the feverish activity of the military group, both in Japan proper and in the Asiatic mainland and in Manchuria, as one observes the violence being done to Chinese personality, the tragic position occupied by the three-quarters of a million Russian refugees who at the time of the Great Dispersion were forced out of Russia or who bet on the wrong nation, or the wrong revolution and who are now without citizenship in the world. Or one senses it as one travels across Siberia and observes the extraordinary development of the Soviet military and air preparations for defence; and perhaps most of all in the official utterances and addresses of the statesmen of the Empire.

I say that we are in the midst of great events in the political life of the world. So far as the East is coned the European situation of these recent months has, of course, tended to obscure the significance of these recent events. With the not unexpected news in this morning's press with regard to the desertion by Japan of the London Naval Conference, the statement to the Soviet Congress by the Central Executive that the Soviet Army is now the largest in the world, 1,300,000 men under arms, their military budget having just been doubled, we face as Canadians a situation which is of very serious moment for all.

I should like, Mr. President, to sketch, for a moment or two to review something of Canada's stake in the Far East. As you know, geographically this country has borders both on the Atlantic Ocean and on the Pacific Basin. Geography has determined for us that we shall be and are on the great highway of world travel. Thoughtful students of world events have gone so far as to say that the Pacific Basin is destined to be in the centuries immediately ahead the third Mediterranean in history, just as the Atlantic Ocean has been called the Second Mediterranean, and just as in the days of classical Greece and when the Roman Empire was at the height of her power and influence during the centuries that followed the founding of the Christian era the Mediterranean Basin was the centre of the world's great currents of thought and of life. With the discovery of North America by Columbus and the revolution in the United States, the French Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, the Great War, the Atlantic Ocean became the second Mediterranean in history. When one considers the rise to the place of a first class power by Japan, following the defeat of Russia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1902, when one thinks of those great forces that are moving in China today among the 450 millions of people that make up that great continent, when one considers the forces that are moving in India, one realizes that with the United States and Canada, the entire Pacific Basin is likely to hold within it the destiny of a great part of the world and this country being now and since the establishment of the League of Nations a signatory to that covenant, a signatory on our own account, not merely as one of the members of the British Empire, when one realizes the position that we occupy, a position of great responsibility as a mediating force between Great Britain and the United States with all that that relationship connotes for the peace of the world, when most thoughtful observers today say without qualification that the way in which Great Britain and the United States think and act will determine in very considerable measure the extent to which peace will prevail in the world, Canada, I say, situated geographically as we are, with the most intimate relations which we have both to the United States of America and to Great Britain, has a responsibility for understanding among these great English-speaking peoples which we can not escape.

If one views the position of Canada in relation to the

Far East from an economic standpoint it is perfectly obvious with the enormous volume of foreign trade which is ours, second on a per capita basis in 1934 among all the nations of the world, fifth in point of volume, our outlook economically in point of trade is of profound significance for us all. If we are unable to see our wheat and our flour and our minerals and the products of our forests in the markets of the world, economically we are in a very bad way, indeed.

So, I say that Canada's stake in the Far East is a very important one. It is a very vital one for ourselves and for the world.

One is frequently asked by Canadians with respect to the clash between Japan and China, this question: "Why has China, that great country with that enormous population, why has China surrendered so easily to little Japan? Well, in the first place, Japan is not little, any more than Great Britain is little. Japan is a great nation in point of population and in point of energy and resources that make her powerful in a military and a naval and an air sense. In the second place, China has not surrendered to Japan. Any surrender that has gone forward to the present time has been a surrender to helplessness. She is quite unable to deal in a military sense, in a naval sense, with the country that has militarized herself to the extent that Japan has.

I should like to make a plea for a better understanding of China. It seems to me that that great Republic is one of the most misunderstood nations of the world and it is perfectly apparent, I think to any student of the Orient that in her fight for national unity and for her sovereignty, that she deserves the active, whole-hearted sympathy and co-operation of all thoughtful students. There are not enough people who appreciate, as you do in Toronto and in Ontario by the establishment of this amazing Royal Museum of Art in which recognition has been given, the debt the world owes China, which from the point of view of art is something that should be more widely understood by our fellow citizens throughout the Dominion. The amazing contribution that China has made to the philosophy of the world, her classics, her culture, has left us in a debt that we can never repay and I think the actions of the British Government a few months ago, with the consent and co-operation of the Nationalist Government of China, whereby on a British battleship there was taken to London and is on display today in Burlington House, the finest exhibit of Chinese art that has ever been brought together in any one place in the history of the world, I say, as a matter of diplomacy, or from the point of view of appreciation of what the world is under by way of a debt to China, is something very fine and as Britishers we should be very proud of it.

May I suggest to you a few of the problems, the great problems confronting China, which are in very considerable measure responsible for this helplessness which I have already referred to. First of all, there is the great depression. China was the last country in the world, perhaps, to feel the effects of the great economic depression, caused financially in large measure by first of all the invasion of Manchuria, and subsequently other provinces in North China, by Japan. Secondly, the extraordinary policy of the Roosevelt Administration with respect to silver. It is quite incomprehensible to me how a nation like the United States of America with her traditional attitude of friendliness to China, an attitude that has been quite outstanding, should with a view solely to dealing with her own national economy, take an action with respect to silver which should prove so demoralizing to the economic and financial and industrial fabric of China.

In the second place, these great recurring floods that the Chinese Government has to deal with year after year. I live on the banks of one of the great rivers of the world, the St. Lawrence River. In the memory of the oldest inhabitant there has been nothing in the nature of a flood that could be characterized in the same terms as these great floods in the Yellow River Valley and the Yangtse Valley and, as you know, the loss of life that is associated with floods is perhaps the least important of all the consequences, serious though that is. But it is the famine that accompanies these floods, it is the chaos, it is the misery, it is the devestation, it is the Bolshevism, it is the lawlessness, the bandits and all of those components that go with floods in a country like China.

If one thinks of the struggle that is on in that Republic today by the Nationalist Government with respect to Communism, 200,000 Communist troops engaged in a life and death struggle for several years now with a Nationalist Army, as to whether Communism shall make headway in that country or not, one realizes it is something that is a very serious menace to the spirit of unity among the provinces which make up the Chinese Republic. The study of Communism in China is an extremely fascinating study. As you know, in 1925, Soviet Russia was the first power to give up her extraterritorial rights in China, thereby doing for that country an act of friendship which was very significant indeed, and if it were not for some of the basic elements in the character of the Chinese people, there is very substantial evidence to suggest that Communism might be the controlling method of government as well as the economic principle in that country today. From the point of view of China's assets, it seems to me that the spirit of co-operation that has characterized so many of the nations of the world in respect to China in her fight for unity is quite impressive. The influence of the United States and Italy in the development of those marvellous air services of China is quite impressive. The rise of Sir Frederick Leith Ross, representing the British Treasury, who is in China today is a most significant matter. What the result of that visit will be one cannot foretell. The co-operation of the League of Nations with respect to rural reconstruction and public health is a matter of record. The contribution of organizations like the Christian Church — I was quite impressed with the effectiveness of the missionary enterprises of the Christian Church in China. Too many people misunderstand the nature of missions today. Hospitalization, social service, rural reconstruction, schools and colleges, as well as the propagating of the Christian philosophy of life, and the organization that I happen to represent, the Young Men's Christian Association, has become indigenous to China. It has had a part in the development of leaders in that country that I was quite unprepared for.

I think the greatest asset China has in her fight for sovereignty is time. I think China has time on her side and I am betting on China in the long run.

Before I leave this subject, I want to suggest for your thinking three immediate consequences to the world of the possible disintegration of China. If China disintegrates there are three things that it seems to me must inevitably follow. First of all, a total dislocation of world trade with China which has already happened in Manchukuo, or Manchuria; second, the end of any hope of securing any return from foreign funds invested in China, and that is a very substantial amount, as you know; in the third place, it will make quite impossible the position of the foreign population in Shanghai, and those of you who know the extraordinary development in the international settlement in Shanghai, can have some appreciation of what that will mean for Canadian interests, British interests, as well as other interests in the Far East.

May I say a word now, Sir, with respect to the present situation in Japan? One visiting Japan for the first time is greatly impressed with the character of the Japanese people, their cleanliness, their sense of order, their industry. It is perfectly unbelievable the way Japanese people work, the way in which boys and girls go to school at eight o'clock in the morning, the way in which they drill all day Saturday—older boys—and the amazing respect for authority which is characteristic of all the Japanese people. From the point of view of the achievements of the Government they are quite remarkable. As you know, modern Japan is identical in its age with Canada, since Confederation. Since Commodore Perry with his United States warship steamed into Nagasaki Harbour and insisted that the doors and the ports of Japan should be opened to foreign trade, a transformation in that country has taken place, to describe which no language could be extravagant, and all adjectives would be dull and colourless. As I say, the rise to the position of a first class power in a military sense since 1902 is in itself an amazing achievement. The conquest of illiteracy—there is no one in Japan who cannot read or write. The sense of mission that the Japanese have today, the civilizing mission, why it parallels the old British idea that we must bear the white man's burden. The mastery, the complete mastery of this amazing western mechanized civilization, whether one views it from the point of heavy industry or the lighter industries, shipyards, railways, textiles, the whole of this mechanized civilization of ours in the West has been taken over by Japan and it has been mastered in a way that makes it quite impressive.

A few words about the problems of Japan. First of all, there is the fear of Russia, a perfectly unbelievable fear by the Japanese military group, of Russia. Afraid, first of all perhaps, of ideas. Well, it seems to those of us in the West that the way to fight dangerous ideas, any ideas, is to fight them with ideas. If the youth of Japan or of China or of Canada have certain ideas, the way to deal with those ideas is with better ideas and not by force and not by driving them underground. Fear of Russian ideas, fear of territorial aggression which I submit, is thoroughly baseless and ungrounded. If one thinks of a map of the world, territorially, what in the world could Russia want any more territory for? She might want that ice-free port of Dairen but it is impossible to think of Soviet Russia risking what would be involved in attempting to secure an ice-free port.

Japan has real problems with respect to population and food supplies and they are the same kind of problems that Great Britain faced during the past century. If you think of the map of the world, it is the most fascinating comparison of the parallel between Great Britain and Japan—those little islands of Japan lying contiguous to the mainland of Asia, just as the British Isles lie in relation to Europe. The British, as you know, solved their problems of over-population in two ways. First of all, by emigration to Canada, to the United States, Australasia, and the world over; and, secondly, by industrialization, the establishment of industry and the securing of markets throughout the world. Japan has those identical problems. Her people would like to migrate to British Columbia. The Government of Canada has a gentleman's agreement with Japan whereby only a few Japanese may come into this country in a given year. The United States Senate has passed an Exclusion Bill whereby no Japanese may enter the United States of America. Australasia, as you know, was to be reserved for the white people and so some of the great sparsely populated areas of the world are denied to Japan. She has a problem with respect to over-population. Now that she has Manchuria, a territory as large as Germany and France put together, there would seem to be a good deal of space there for her surplus population. Unfortunately her people do not like the kind of climate that there is in Manchuria, but it does seem to an unbiased observer that the great markets of China are open to Japan and industrialization could proceed in a way that would help her to solve many of her problems.

Another of her problems seems to be associated with the structural defects in her government which enables the military group in effect to act independently of the Diet, or Parliament, a most extraordinary thing from a British point of view. Take, for example, the conquest of Manchuria in 1921 when that military group in Japan, in solemn disregard of the fact that Japan was a signatory to the Covenant of the League, and the Nine-Power Treaty by which she guaranteed the territorial integrity of China, and her signature to the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact, whereby along with the other nations of the world she renounced war as an instrument of national policy. I say that the military group in Japan, because of this curious structural defect in the government, by her deeds has broken all three of those solemn covenants and obligations and any nation or group of nations which undertakes to destroy or endanger the still fragile structure of international peace shoulders a responsibility, in the light of the loss of eleven million of the flower of the world's youth in the Great War, I say shoulders a responsibility that is too hideous for human speech to express.

What, then, is the hope of the situation with respect to Japan? It seems to me it lies in the moderate group in the country and no man knows how large this group is. It may be very large. Certainly the military group are in the saddle today but whether they will call a halt, permit their industrialists to conquer the markets of Asia in friendly rivalry with other powers or not is something history will have to tell us. Some students of the political situation in the East feel that finance is really the all important factor which may yet impress the military group with the attractiveness of peace and of goodwill. That is to say, Japan is a relatively poor country, the cost of the occupation of Manchuria has been very great. Visualize for yourselves the cost of the maintenance of the army in those great northern areas of China or the cost of the purchase of the Chinese Eastern Railway, that Soviet Railway in Manchuria which two years ago was bought by the Japanese Government; or think of the price of Soya beans in the market of the world, or the coking qualities of coal, or the disappointing returns in shale oil, and one can get some appreciation of what the cost of this policy of territorial aggression in Asia may mean and does mean for the Japanese government and people. In modern warfare as you know, the bill is always presented and must somehow be paid. Many students of international finance say that their need is greater resources, far greater resources than even energetic Japan commands to make their country the Mistress of the Pacific in opposition to the interests and the conscience of the civilized world.

I wish time permitted of making a contrast between the Japanese idea or policy of colonial administration and that of Great Britain. It is a perfectly fascinating study. Japan has adopted in her colonial policy as evidenced by her administration of Korea, which country she has had now for over twenty-five years, she has adopted the policy of centralization on the old Spanish idea, the German idea, the French idea, as contrasted with the British idea of decentralization.

I live in the Province of Quebec where we have, as you know, French Canada—a large number of French people. The principle of self-government, the maintenance of the language and the culture and the religion of these people who make up the British Empire is thoroughly well known by you all and very easily demonstrated in my own province. At Quebec we have Mr. Taschereau, a French-Canadian Prime Minister—just now— and his Legislature is predominantly French, Mayor Houde of Montreal and his Council, in the parochial schools of the Province of Quebec, Roman Catholic priests, the French language, their own religion. It works, self-government of the people.

Similarly in South Africa with the Boers. There is no attempt to make Londoners out of the Boers or Londoners out of the Hottentots, or Englishmen out of Frenchmen, or what have you?

But in Korea, the idea of self-government of subject people is quite foreign to the Japanese colonial administration and in all of the government processes and in the schools, the Japanese are in control. There is a thorough-going policy of the Japanization of that country which suggests that a study of the relative colonial policies might prove to be very rewarding to any one interested in the future of the Pacific.

I want to say a few words about Russia because it is the frontier provinces of China that this modern Japan, with its mastery of this western civilization on a materialistic side comes into conflict in the sharpest way with Russia, Soviet Russia, the nursery of Bolshevism, and I should like to say a few words about Soviet Russia today. As one crosses through Siberia on the trans-Siberian Railway which, as you know, is the longest railway journey one can take in the world, there are so many distinct and obvious and impressive evidences of progress that it is simply undeniable and one must accept Soviet Russia among the nations of the world as a going concern and it would seem to me that the Russian Experiment is likely to be of the greatest possible value to the world. One must admire greatly, I think, many of the institutions and the ideas which characterize the Soviet system, or life in Russia. Their prison system, it is quite true it is most humane. There is no stigma attached to a prisoner upon completing his term as there is in my Province. Of course that is for persons who commit crimes within the Party. Those who commit crimes against the Party receive no mercy within the merciful system of the Soviet. But with regard to the school system or the hospital system or their attitude toward other races, you realize it is a criminal offence in Russia to speak disrespectfully of a Jew. In Montreal that isn't the fact. In their Peoples' Courts their efforts to develop a co-operative society, to develop a society where there are literally no parasites —I think there are many things in the Soviet system that are most commendable and admirable and challenging. I think they are a great asset to the collective system of security among the powers. But Canadians, to be realistic at all about Russia, and I am thinking now of young Canadians, ought to realize that the standards of living in Russia are so far below the standards of living in this country that to look out on that land and that government and those people as the Paradise of the world is to disregard realism in its entirety. Canadians, too, I think, should understand that there is no freedom in Russia. There is no freedom of thought, no freedom of speech, no freedom of assembly, or of association, or of the press. There just isn't any freedom except to the 2,000,000 members of the Party who control the destinies of the 162 million other citizens of Russia. There is the suppression of opposition to the Party as by violence and not by the slower processes of the Anglo-Saxon world and furthermore that absolute power tends to produce corruption.

That idea of world revolution is a fact. I didn't speak to anybody in Moscow on en route across Siberia who did not say that the idea of world revolution by the workers of the world—Capitalism will not budge, up with the workers and down with Capitalism sort of thing—I didn't speak to any who didn't say that was a fact in the Russian mind however unofficial it may be. For myself, as a Canadian, I resent the whole idea of our revolutions being determined or in a large measure influenced in a country so remote from Canada, from its institutions, where the ideas are so different, the standard of living is so different. I am quite persuaded that whatever changes are necessary can quite competently be dealt with by ourselves. (Applause.)

I am interested in the idea and philosophy of religion. In Russia, the Soviet Government, as you know, is the implacable foe of organized religion and all forms of religion and they have an extraordinarily influential method of propagating their anti-religious views and doctrines and they preach very capably the idea that "Religion is the opiate of the people." I ask you for a moment whether there is anything in the nature of a narcotic that characterized the heroism of the Buddhist missionaries in Japan or in the religion of the Moslem missionaries, that great flaming religion of the world.

Is there anything in the shape of heroin or opium in the followers of Mohammed? Or if one looks on Judaism and reflects the fortitude of the Jewish people, is there anything in the nature of a narcotic about the qualities that have enabled the Jewish people through their long history to stand true to what they thought was reality, or in the history of the Christian religion to which you and I owe so much, It is a thoroughly unworthy doctrine is this doctrine of dogmatic atheism that is being preached to the youth of Russia.

Mr. President, in conclusion, there are many thoughtful students of the international situation who feel we are now at one of the great turning points in the history of the world, comparable perhaps to that period when the Middle Ages gave birth to the modern world and it seems to me there are three alternatives for mankind: First, of all, the idea of Bolshevism. I don't mean by Bolshevism—Communism, either as an economic theory or a political principle. I mean by Bolshevism, the methods of Communism as revealed by the Russian Revolution and its effort to impose Communism on China, and the idea of Bolshevism with its idea of bloodshed, disorder, lawlessness and chaos—it is thoroughly intolerable for us all.

The second alternative is that of Nationalism, the policy of isolation, the interests of one state above the welfare of all, and it seems to me any nation that follows that pathway will by the inescapable working of the cosmic moral law be the cause of her downfall, and you know the nations of the world today who would seem to be following that pathway are Germany and Italy and Japan.

The third alternative is that of Internationalism, which is the policy today of the British Empire and emphasis on co-operation and not force, a spirit which seeks to develop the collective system of security. It is an attitude, I think, which seeks to conserve the best in all governments and voluntary agencies at work, internationally and inter-racially, for a better world. There are great international tasks and challenges which can and should appeal to every nation in the world working together through the League, if you will. The struggle for peace is a common task, challenging all the nations of the world. The suppression of the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs which the League of Nations has given such splendid leadership to is a great challenge. There is the problem of these refugees throughout the world. It seems to me, Sir, Canadians as partners in the Empire should stand four-square behind the Empire in the policy being pursued today by her statesmen for a sane and fine and noble internationalism. (Hearty applause.)

MR. H. C. BOURLIER: Gentlemen, with a view to developing public speaking among the executives of The Empire Club, I am going to ask our Second Vice-President, Mr. Armstrong to thank the speaker.

MR. J. S. P. ARMSTRONG: Mr. President, Gentlemen, and our Guest Speaker: This isn't fair—it was sprung upon me at the last minute. However, let me on behalf of The Empire Club and the members express to you, Mr. Beaton our sincere appreciation of the excellent address we have just listened to. It has been a policy of The Empire Club to devote the majority of their luncheon addresses to questions of vital interest to the British Empire. Undoubtedly, the Far East today is of vital interest to the British Empire. They hold a tremendous stake there, as does Canada, and I feel it is incumbent upon all thinking Canadians to give a sane, quiet, sympathetic understanding to the problems of the Far East, because within the next ten years we will find that Canada will play, undoubtedly, a major part in whatever happens in that particular boiling pot of the world.

We extend to you, Sir, our appreciation of this excellent and comprehensive address which has covered a subject that is of such vital interest to all of us. (Applause.)

ROADS TO THE FUTURE

An Address by MR. JOHN W. DAFOE

January 30, 1936

President Brace: Gentlemen, one does not introduce a guest speaker to the members of The Empire Club when the speaker is making his third appearance before that body. But even so, I find some little difficulty in presenting John W. Dafoe to you today. Shall I speak of him as Mr. Dafoe, or as Dr. Dafoe?

R. T. L., in one of his inimitable biographies, which were published in MacLean's Magazine in 1933, says of him, "He is a Doctor of Laws but nobody calls him Doctor, except visiting Englishmen who imagine he likes it."

Again, if I were to refer to him as Dr. Dafoe, there might be some misunderstanding on the part of the radio audience who might think we have that other illustrious Canadian citizen with us today. In so far as I am aware, John W. Dafoe lays no claim to having any special knowledge of obstetrics, so if I refer to him as Mr. Dafoe, I hope I shall in no way detract from any honour which he has.

As Editor for thirty-five years or nearly thiry-five years of the Winnipeg Free Press, he has commanded a great influence throughout the Canadian West. He is known to some as "The prophet of the Prairies." He is recognized as one who has consistently desired diminishing tariffs, but above all he is known to all of us as a very fine Canadian citizen and one who has always upheld those things which would be of value to the people of Canada. For many years he was the close associate of Sir Clifford Sifton and Sir Clifford's biography was written by Mr. Dafoe. As well, over a long period of time, he was the confidant of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and I am sure Sir Wilfrid gained great strength and assistance through those contacts.

Mr. Dafoe will speak to us today on the subject, "Roads to the Future." (Applause.)

Mr. John W. Dafoe: Mr. Chairman: I should like to say first that I appreciate the compliment of being asked to speak to this organization for, as the Chairman said, the third time. Perhaps this may be a case of the third time and out.

Now, in the title of my address I was careful to include the word "future." In my knowledge of human nature I have learned that most men, whatever they may think of the present, have some hope for the future. It is a kind of instinctive faith, just as they have a belief in the fabled past. They dream that there was a time when mankind was prosperous, happy, and they dream, too, that that time may come again. It is one of the deep human instincts.

Now, we know that the idea of a fabled past was a myth. It never existed anywhere. There are people of some eminence in the world who seem to think that the golden age of England was the Middle Ages. I would say that a proper reward for them would be to submerge them for a year or so in the Middle Ages, where they would be able to have first hand knowledge of a period of violence, poverty and, I would say, of high smells.

The present is habitually lightly esteemed. We never think much of it. Our idea of good times in the present is a good deal like the distribution of jam in "Alice in Wonderland," where they had it yesterday and tomorrow but never today.

I think most of us who are pretty well along in life are apt to regard the years before the War as years of stability and order and progress; but I was interested to note, reading a book the other day, that a man who occupied a relationship to those years, comparable to that which those of us who are old occupy to this, had about as poor an opinion of those times as we have of ours. Thirty years ago Henry Adams wrote "The Education of Henry Adams," and he referred to those years which we think in retrospect were a great improvement on present times. He said, "The world was irritable, nervous, querulous, unreasonable and afraid." I think those are adjectives which perhaps many of us would think fitted today like a glove. And he said that chaos was the law of nature and order was the dream of man. Something we also hear today. But he looked forward to better times and he put a date. He ventured to put a date when conceivably the world would be entering upon an era such as men looked forward to. In the concluding words of his volume he expressed the hope that perhaps upon the centenary of the birth of himself and his two particular friends, John Hay and Charles King, they would be allowed to revisit the world. That was to be in 1938, two years from now. And he says, these are the concluding words of that book: "Perhaps some day—say in 1938, their centenary—they might be allowed to return together for a holiday to see the mistakes of their own lives made clear in the light of the mistakes of their successors; and perhaps for the first time since man began his education among the carnivorous they would find a world that sensitive and timid natures could regard without a shudder."

Well, if Henry Adams were permitted to come back in 1938 he would be somewhat disappointed or we should have to do a considerable job of cleaning things up in the two years that remain.

We are now pretty much where Henry Adams was thirty years ago. Disillusioned and fearful of the chaotic conditions of the present, we look forward with desire and perhaps some measure of expectation to the future. And our faith, our vague faith, is that the improvement will come gratuitiously, that merely by the passage of time this future will arrive and many of our difficulties will be solved; and in some way the generations will enter into a better day.

Well, we simply bemuse ourselves if we cherish that idea. It would be well to bear in mind that the present of today was the future of yesterday and that it is what it is because of the human actions, the human decisions from yesterday. Therefore the future will be what we make it and it would better become us if, instead of drifting aimlessly with the tide, we put some thought, some resolution into preparation of a highway along which the future generations can go forward. That brings me to the subject of my address.

What is practicable and attainable now? Is anything practicable and attainable now which would give some slight aspect of certainty to a better future? We have had twenty-one years of almost unexampled strain; and yet it is possible for a man, so informed a man as John R. Mott, to say on the public platform, as I have heard him say twice in the last two months, that the world is today in a state of unprecedented danger. To say this when we recall the war and the impossible post war conditions that we have lived through sounds like an exaggeration. It seems it must be an exaggeration but yet I question whether it is not literally true, that at this moment the world and mankind, civilization, is in the most dangerous position it has ever faced.

Now, why is the danger greater, more threatening than before August, 1914? Because everything indicates that man is in a more desperate mood than he was then. The nations, as Lloyd George has often said, stumbled or slipped into the Great War without just knowing what they were letting themselves in for. The idea was still current at that time that a war could be fought, not only for glory, but for profit. But now we know better. Mankind knows the appalling range of the destructiveness of war. Mankind knows that war settles no problems or if it settles any it creates ten problems for every one that it settles. It knows that the more victorious a country is, the greater the damage to it. Man must know, if he has any capacity for reason, that modern war doesn't come to an end, that you can't bring it to an end in an honourable peace and make a new start. It sets going a process of destruction that goes on year after year in widening circles of damage and violence.

Now, if this be true, as it most indubitably is true, surely if we are interested in controlling the future in some measure, surely it is our first and paramount duty to recognize our responsibility to the future to stop war as an instrument of national policy, if this be possible. This obligation is the first, the foremost, the most essential for this generation, for a world fit for human beings to live in cannot be built while there is recurrent war or the possibility of it. You don't have to have actual war. If war is possible, you cannot build a world fit for human beings to live in. Until we can attain our desired end, until this generation or the next generation or the generation a hundred years from now attain it, the people who deal in futures, human futures, from the pedlar of panaceas to the wise and foresighted builders might as well take a holiday. There will, of course, be a future of sorts for man, no matter what happens. I don't suppose that man will go the way of the dinosaurs who lost out because their brain was so small that they could not adjust themselves to changing circumstances. That will probably not be the fate of the species that has been described, perhaps inaccurately, by the scientists, as Homo sapiens. In time, no doubt, man will learn, but in the advertising phrase, if he is going to learn eventually, why not now?

How can something be done? Is it possible for anything to be done? Well, there is no way of stopping this march to ruin, except by reverting to the attitude and the mood of the men who founded the League of Nations in Paris in 1919. That is by collective action, by agreement among the countries to stop once and for all the waging of war by any individual country upon its own initiative for the furthering of its own ends and to compel it to submit its case to the judgement of the nations, acting collectively. The framers of the League came to Paris with the lesson of the war imprinted upon them. They knew that that was the first thing to do and that if it could not be done, it was useless to hope for permanent peace. They sought a way to make it impossible for any country, upon grounds which it considered good or in pursuit of its ambitions, to wage war; and thus give final and ultimate expression to the principle of collective security. ,

It was my good fortune as a newspaper man to see the League of Nations come into existence in the hall of the Foreign Office of the French Government. I was deeply impressed with the earnestness of the man who read the Covenant to the Assembly, Woodrow Wilson. I was asked less than a week ago whether I still thought there was any value in the League of Nations, whether its life could be continued and whether its past could be fulfilled and I said, "Well, I saw the brat born and I am going to stay with it as long as it has a bit of life in its body." (Applause.) And I think it has considerable, myself. I don't think the word, "Finis" is to be written yet to its career.

The result of those actions in Paris was the creation of the League and the writing into international law of an entirely new principle, the principle that war must not become the ultimate expression of national policy but that the keeping of the world peace was the collective responsibility of the nations of the world—later on, war was formally outlawed by resolution of the League of Nations and by the Kellogg Pact, an instrument in which great hopes were placed but which has been revealed by recent developments as a most heart-breaking disappointment.

Now the promulgation of that principle was a great conception, one of those great ideas which come to the world at intervals and influence for all time the destiny of man. It may be that the world will go through a hundred years of international gangsterism, waged by scientific savages, but that ideal will persist. You can't destroy that ideal. You can't bury it. You can't forget it. You may postpone it indefinitely or for generations but it will survive the tumult and the shouting. It will be there as long as there are stars in the Heavens, a beacon light to the generations.

Now, this question is an actual issue today, as to whether there is to be a postponement, perhaps for a long period of time, or whether this principle will be operative. Shall the League prevail and go on to greater conquests or shall it fail, in which case we shall be again at the bottom of the hill with the long ascent before us?

Canadian audiences have had a great many views on this question from distinguished visitors. I think five rather noted British publicists, all friends of mine, have been addressing audiences here, in Montreal and elsewhere and I have been interested to notice that while in past years there were great divergencies of view among them, they practically all said the same thing in the enlightenment of the developments of the times. One of these five in a letter which I got from him about the end of the year put the issue in a very few words. I don't think it could be better put. He says the next few years are going to be absolutely vital in international affairs. The risks of the League system are going to be enormous, it is undoubtedly true, but the certainties which will follow a crude return to the pre war alliance system which will be inevitable if the League fails, are far worse. That is really the issue. It is a choice between risks and certainties, with the certainties being worse than the greatest danger of the risks.

I am extremely well aware of all the arguments against the League. I have read them and had them dinned in my ears for years, and I think I could recite them in my sleep. If you look at them with blinkers and take a narrow view they have a certain element of validity but if you look at them in relation to the setting of the world, they are to my mind entirely fallacious. If we could contract ourselves out of the League and its obligations, and obtain a liberty of action so that we could control our own future, we would be foolish to accept the responsibility of the League, but we can't do it. No nation can do it. Canada can't do it. I, for one, and I think anybody who has been through the last twenty or twenty-five years, ought to regard as the most terrible alternative a return to the conditions of twenty years ago, multiplied and accentuated as they will be by the additional resources of science. All our great discoveries of science which are meant for the betterment of mankind are at once adapted and put to the use of war so that mankind, by its ingenuity, is in a fair way to destroy itself.

So, I say, that that is the first essential of the road to the future, to stop war; and it has to be stopped by an ad hoc process, the principle that first things have to come first and you can't do anything unless you first stop war.

But of course you can't stop there. You can't stop there or your principle of peace by collective security would become an agency of reaction by stereotyping the world in its present condition, with all its inequalities; and so you must have, you must build international machinery for something flexible, something easily adaptable which will deal with the injustices and inequalities of today and will provide for further readjustments as time goes on. Many people will say this is impossible. Well, I don't think anything is impossible if there is enough pressure behind. There is a rule which says, what can't be endured has got to be cured. This is a case for its application. I do not think it is diffiicult, particularly if the instincts and ambitions for war are blocked. This is the poison root which makes these adjustments between nations impossible.

We hear a great deal now of the controversy between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots.' A great deal of the case presented on behalf of the 'have-nots' is pure humbug. It is an attempt to rationalize and justify policies which were entered upon for very different purposes; but in a world where war occurs from time to time there is a measure of possible validity behind these demands of the powers that they shall have their share of undeveloped areas in the world and their resources. However, in a world where war is a possibility, you can't keep the peace by allocating the territory and resources of supply of subject peoples among the various nations. There isn't enough of it to go around and if you made an allocation tomorrow which would be satisfactory, in ten years the shifting circumstances would make a new allocation possible.

Then there is the little difficulty which is increasing all the time, that the allocation of human beings among people who propose to control them, is more and more getting out of date. The whole conception of war is based on a self-sufficiency of power and a self-sufficiency of resources. This couldn't be done if there were only two empires in the world in place of a multiplicity of nations. Neither individual nations nor empires can become self-sufficient, nor can their security be assured by alliances or power alignments. I do not think it is really necessary to argue this.

The results of the abolition of war in the economic world would be immense, profound, far-reaching and continuing. If you abolished war you would be surprised how much of the faith in economic nationalism which is based upon some real necessity would evaporate because the justification for it would no longer be there. One of the first evidences would be a realization that dependencies, subject peoples, must be administered as trusts and that they at least must be open to something very nearly approaching free trade. That is, all the world would have access under fair terms to the common resources and supplies of the world; and I would have some hope that the advantages of that system would lead to its widening. Economic nationalism and doctrines of self-sufficiency are the children of war and they are the progenitors of war; and in my opinion, they will all die together.

Now, the third essential. The third essential is the continuance of democratic government. I don't think it is necessary to labour that point. Democracies can't exist in the world if there isn't democratic government and I think that the future may indicate very clearly that democratic government cannot continue to exist unless there is peace. War is essentially a functioning of autocratic power. Democracies may fight by reason of foolishness, but dictators must fight as a necessity of their being. Under democratic government great policies and projects for human betterment can be initiated, tested, tried out, modified, so, as the needs of the human race develop, there will be corresponding agencies for their furthering. But under dictatorship you have the imposition of policies arrived at by a process of divination, of inspiration; and if they don't work, as they never do, they can only be changed by disaster.

So, the roads to the future are clearly defined and readily available to the nations, if they will take them. First, and most essential, collective peace, from which two sequences will follow—an abatement of economic nationalism, making the resources of the world one under principles which are reasonable. And second, a continuance of democratic government.

Now, the road is there. It is not at the moment attractive to the peoples of the world or to many of them. It lies too straight to suit them. They listen to the barkers along the road who tell them that just down this byway, just a step around the corner, there is Paradise, there is Utopia, there is the fulfilling of all their desires and wishes; with the result that they turn aside and get lost in the morass, in the wilderness. I think that is the condition of the peoples of the world today; they are all more or less lost in the woods. The road is there if only they would come back to it. Perhaps we are justified in hoping that we are beginning to see the end of these ventures into the byways, that some progress may be seen by this generation toward the attainment of that future of peace, contentment, happiness and achievement which all down the ages has been the dream of the visionaries and the prophets.

Now, I have just one thing more to say. Is this a purely academic talk or has it a local application to you here in this hall and to the people of Canada? Believe me, it has a local application. I find a persistent belief in Canada that we have a safe, reserved seat and that we can look on at this bloodshed, this turmoil, this chaos. It is not so. We are in the vortex and if the world goes to hell, we will go with it. Don't make any mistake about that.

Gentlemen, these are things about which I feel strongly; and though I am not particularly fond of public speaking, I have for years never missed an opportunity to talk about them to my fellow men. I was of the generation that was too old to go to the War. I was represented by my sons. I think I have shared a feeling with everybody my own age, that in some way the generation that was too old to go to the war had a large measure of culpability for the fact that we have lost a generation of our race. Well, there is nothing much we old fellows can do but I speak to men here who have the future before them. I adjure you to see to it that we do not have another lost generation. (Hearty applause.)

President Brace: I can assure the members of the Empire Club that this will not be the last time an invitation will be extended to Mr. Dafoe to be our guest speaker. (Applause.)

I think I would make a very serious mistake if I attempted to comment in any way on the serious thoughts expressed by Mr. Dafoe today. Rather, I will leave them with you, undefiled by anything that I might say.

On your behalf, I extend to Mr. Dafoe our most serious and sincere thanks for coming and giving us this very stern address today. (Applause.)

OUR NATIONAL TASK

An Address by MR. JOHN M. IMRIE

Thursday, February 6th, 1936

Mr. J. H. Brace, the President of the Club, presided, and addressed the gathering as follows:

Members of the Empire Club of Canada are very glad indeed to welcome today the members of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and to have them join with us in this luncheon. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce has affiliated with it the various Boards of Trade of Canadian cities from Coast to Coast. This organization was conceived some ten years ago by one of the members of our Club, Mr. S. B. Gundy, who was its first president. Business representatives of various interests and various sections of the country are convened at this time in Toronto. While they represent various interests, they have a common goal, that which is to the best interests of Canada and of Canadians as a whole.

True, the past few years there has been considerable criticism of the management of business, both in Canada and elsewhere. No thinking man would place the responsibility for all the ills which this world has been going through in the past few years on the business men of our community. On the other hand, those men are quite prepared to accept their full share of responsibility. In the past they have pursued a somewhat inarticulate policy. I think that has been a mistake and there is a definite trend now for those leaders in business to come forward and tell their problems to the public, so that the public will have the other side of the case as well as the one presented by other people within our community. In doing so, they will have a number of avenues through which they can present the case—through the press, over the radio and by means of various public forums. The Empire Club of Canada has for years been the forum for common consideration of the members of the community, and I want to assure the Canadian Chamber of Commerce that we will welcome at any time members from that Chamber who are prepared to come and address this gathering on any subject that is of interest and value to the community and to the people of Canada.

I am very pleased at this time to introduce to you Mr. W. M. Birks, Past President of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, who will introduce our guest speaker.

MR. W. M. BIRKS: Mr. President and Gentlemen: It is indeed a pleasure to join in this function with the Empire Club. Is it not eminently suitable that Empire spirit should join with trade and commerce? It reminds me, it is not many months since in the Guild Hall of London I heard Mr. Stanley Baldwin say that the British Empire had been built not so much by the soldier, the sailor or the statesman as by the trading genius of the British race. It is a fine thing to be a citizen of Canada, but it is a finer thing to be a citizen of that most unique thing in history, the British Empire.

Before introducing our guest of honour, may I say that the Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the British Empire meets every three years alternately in London, the capital of the Empire and in one of the Dominions. It has met twice in Canada, twice in Australia, once in South Africa and is meeting this year for the first time, its 14th congress, in New Zealand. May I say that I hope Toronto in its Empire Club and its Board of Trade may be represented there. Gentlemen, you can leave Toronto on the 5th of September, and be in New Zealand in time for the opening of the congress on the 1st of October, and after a week's conference the remainder of the month we will be guests of that dominion, with free transportation on all the railroads in the north and south Islands, and we will be home by the 15th of December.

May I commend the suggestion to you. It will be a royal trip, and I would feel very badly if the Queen City was not represented.

Born in Toronto, where he lived until 1921, and then moving to Edmonton as one of our great newspaper editors of the Great West, Mr. John M. Imrie, has had his life divided between a great industrial centre of Eastern Canada and a great agricultural centre of Western Canada. I am sure to a Toronto audience of his native city, he needs no introduction. He will speak on the subject of "Our National Task." Mr. John M. Imrie!

MR. JOHN M. IMRIE: Mr. President, Mr. Toast Master and Gentlemen: It is indeed a privilege to address once again both the Empire Club of Canada and an annual convention of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, this time on one and the same occasion. For the kindness of the invitation that has made that possible, I would like to express again my warm thanks to the presidents of both organizations and to their respective committees and members. I would like also to thank Mr. Birks for his very kind introduction.

It is of the Prairie West in particular that I have been asked to speak to you today. I would do so not in any sectional or partisan spirit but from the standpoint of broad national interest.

It is hardly necessary for me to remind you that in pre-depression days the purchasing power of the prosperous prairie area contributed substantially to industrial employment and general prosperity throughout Eastern Canada. That power was based largely on the creation of new wealth from the soil, chiefly in the form of wheat.

But as you know, with the world depression, wheat became for the moment a glut on world markets. The price for No. 1 Northern, to the farmers of my province, for example, dropped to an all-time low of 21c per bushel, less than one-fifth of the price in 1929. There were large concurrent reductions in the prices of Western livestock and other mixed farming products.

Premier Bracken of Manitoba estimated some little time ago that the curtailment of purchasing power of the Prairie provinces during the first four years of depression averaged $450,000,000 a year, a total for those four years of one billion, eight hundred million dollars. You know only too well how that contributed to idleness of industrial plants and unemployment of industrial workers throughout Eastern Canada.

It did much more than that. It contributed very definitely to the aggravation of our railway problem. For this I have no less an authority than he who was the guest speaker here yesterday, Sir Edward Beatty. I quote from his annual report to shareholders at the 1934 annual meeting, as follows:

"In a very peculiar sense the prosperity of this country depends upon the prosperity of agriculture and therefore Western Canada, from which territory about 60 per cent of its freight earnings are normally derived,"—*from which territory—Western Canada—about* 60 *per cent of its freight earnings are normally derived.*

It is therefore a matter of very great national concern that recovery throughout Western Canada should be hastened in every possible and proper way. Unfortunately it is lagging somewhat behind recovery in the East; that always happens in depressions. This time, apart from that natural lag, it is being retarded by the adverse effects of several major mistakes in past development policies in the West. I propose that we should examine some of those mistakes today, frankly, dispassionately, as Canadians. Certain of them are of the West alone; certain of them are of Canada. For I would remind you that until five years ago the control of natural resources and of land settlement in the three prairie provinces was in the hands of the Federal Government and was exercised from Ottawa.

First and fundamental among these mistakes is that haphazard settlement, the scattering of 290,000 farm units over the vast stretch from southeastern Manitoba to the Peace River block in northern British Columbia—a stretch even as the crow flies of more than 1200 miles. With the hindsight which is usually clearer than foresight it is apparent now that if we had had in those early days orderly settlement with areas closer in being reasonably well filled before areas farther out were opened up to homestead entry, one Prairie province would have quite sufficed and enormous expenditures on railroads, other roads, government buildings, government itself, education and various other public services would have been avoided. Moreover with the wide spread and haphazard settlement—as part of it—and in the absence of soil testing and accurate knowledge of climatic conditions, availability of water, etc., tens of thousands of settlers were permitted to locate in those early years on sub-marginal lands where ultimate failure or at best precarious living was a certainty.

Secondly, there was the mistake of over extension of wheat production, of too big concentration on one unit of production. In the early days of Western settlement very great emphasis was placed upon wheat production in the West. That area was pictured as one of "easy money," where two or three crops of wheat would put a new settler on "easy street." Many farmers were attracted to the West from Eastern Canada and from other countries by the prospect of getting away from the hard work for twelve months in the year that they had been accustomed to as mixed farmers. Others again, having very little capital, sought to get established through the means of wheat as a cash crop, fully intending to diversify production later, but were gradually weaned from that intention by their observation of the relatively greater ease of wheat raising. That applied to many other settlers who had actually gone in for diversification, but seeing that their wheat-raising friends had a much easier life apparently than they, they too were weaned away from sounder methods of farming.

Then with the war there came patriotic appeals to grow more and still more wheat. During the four war years, 1915-18, the wheat acreage in Saskatchewan and Alberta was increased by almost 100%. It was during this period, this period of pressure as a war measure, that much of the sub-marginal lands were opened up for wheat raising. That and the personal grief and economic loss that has followed it, must be regarded as one of the economic tragedies of the war in Canada.

Co-incident with this and as a natural corollary of it, the unit of farm-holding in the West was gradually extended until finally it became 388 acres as compared with 118 in Ontario and 128 in Quebec.

Regarding a third major mistake—an unwarranted increase in public and private debt—I need hardly say that that was not confined to the West. There it was a corollary of the two major mistakes already mentioned plus unwise ventures into railway and irrigation projects and very great extensions of social services.

A fourth mistake was the withholding of our wheat from world markets in 1929, with a view to forcing—one might as well be frank—higher prices, and the associated policy of cutting adrift from the established wheat trade selling agencies in Great Britain and elsewhere. That resulted in great losses to individual farmers, causing many to go more deeply into debt; it led to the estrangement of the established wheat selling trade of Europe; it helped to pile up a surplus of wheat: it blinded our eyes to the fact that the world wheat supply was even then beginning to outrun the purchasing power for consumption at that time.

This brief citation of four major mistakes—I do not pretend that they are all—but this brief citation of four will help, I hope, to point the way to certain corrective measures.

One must surely be a very thorough and a very searching enquiry into the whole problem of sub-marginal lands and settlement thereon throughout the prairie provinces. Thus far we have more or less played with that problem. There is a tendency in some quarters to say, "Hush! Hush! There will be another series of wet years." But meanwhile in certain large areas characterized by those lands more than half of the occupied farms have been abandoned during the last six years and many of the remainder are being sustained only through lavish public expenditures on public relief. Meanwhile also a host of contradictory solutions are being suggested by various parties, and no one actually knows what the full solution is. Certain areas will have to be evacuated. But that is not the whole solution. Fortunately within the past few months a start has been made on such an investigation, and I earnestly hope that it will be made quickly and very thoroughly with the best of expert help that is obtainable, and that it will ascertain:—first, the actual conditions; second, the extent to which parts of those areas should be evacuated in the light of present world prices and the need therefore of minimum production cost and high production quality; third, the remedial measures that are sound and proper and workable financially; and fourth, what should be done with those settlers who must be moved to lands of greater promise, and how they are to be rehabilitated. This is a terrible problem, complicated and delicate, and I am most anxious that we will not go at it half-cocked, repeating the mistakes we have made in the past, but that first of all we should discover all its complications.

Secondly, there should be every possible encouragement to the present tendency towards a greater diversification of farm production on the prairies (or rather in those portions of the prairies that are suited for mixed farming) and to the full extent of available markets.

To that end the agreements presently in force with Great Britain are most helpful. They have permitted of an increase, since they became effective, of 800 per cent in the production of hogs in Canada. Even at that, our total production last year represented in bacon and hams only 45% of the quota guaranteed to us under that trade agreement. I earnestly hope that by 1937 we will have attained that quota, and that no reasonable effort will be spared to bring about a renewal of the agreement and the retention of at least the present quota. Similarly, the reciprocal agreement recently made with the United States is giving to the prairies a new outlet for cattle, and in that way is encouraging mixed farming. The principle that is represented in these two agreements should be extended as opportunity may be found, both to other mixed farming products in relation to the countries with which those two agreements exist, and also to other countries which are ready and able to use the products of Western mixed farming.

This further diversification of Western production will lead to a desirable and a necessary "thickening-up" of settlement in the better farming areas of the prairies. That in turn will tend to broaden the base for present public plant there—railways, government, roads, education, and other public services—and tend to give some easement in the carriage of debt burden.

Further "thickening-up" will come through the movement to such areas of those who public policy would find should be moved from the least promising of the submarginal lands.

But even that will not provide the necessary degree of "thickening up." So I urge again, as I have repeatedly in the past, the colonization on small units for subsistence farming rather than farming for export, of many of our unemployed who have had previous farm experience or have a natural aptitude for farming. Obviously that will have other benefits, in lessening the burden of relief, in creating new tax payers, and in strengthening or restoring morale.

Even that will not be sufficient. Immigration is a rather unwelcome word in these days of unemployment, but I believe the time will soon be here when it will be considered both desirable and necessary to institute a limited and restrictive form of immigration, with a view to locating on small farms in proven mixed farming areas, people with previous farming experience, who are in a position to locate there and become established either through their own means or in some cases through assistance that may be provided by their respective governments.

But there are large areas in the West that are not suited either by climatic conditions or by water supply for mixed farming. Moreover the local market there for its products is definitely limited. Therefore wheat will continue to be one of the major items of production throughout the West. In view of the lowering of world wheat prices, it has become necessary for our Western farmers to strive hard for the greatest possible reduction in cost of producing wheat. Fortunately the world market for wheat is steadily, or gradually rather, brightening. Within recent months good progress has been made in removing antagonisms that were created in Great Britain and in Continental Europe, and there is some ground for anticipating a steady though slow improvement in the general wheat situation. In that connection, may I remind you that the greatest influx of land settlement the West has ever had in a like period was during the decade preceding the war, and in that decade "$1.00 at Fort William" was the veritable "pot of gold" at the end of the proverbial rainbow, something to be looked forward to but actually attained only in parts of the three years immediately preceding the war. Of course production costs were low then, but during the past five years many a farmer throughout the West has reduced those costs that are within his own control back to pre-war levels. Unfortunately he has to pay much more than those levels for most goods he has to buy. If he is to stay in wheat and be a consumer, at present and prospective world prices, every possible assistance must be given to him through a measure of further reduction in costs of what he has to buy, somewhat approaching the reduction he has made himself in those costs that are within his own control.

One word about the burden of debt. The "thickening up" that I have suggested will help somewhat to alleviate it, but that will be a slow process. Meanwhile I welcome most warmly the proposals the present Federal government has made for aid in refunding the debts of our Provinces with provisions for ear-marking of Federal subsidies and certain Provincial taxes, and with restrictions on future capital borrowings. I earnestly hope my own Province and the other two prairie Provinces will accept those proposals. They are right in line with what my own paper has been urging for the past two years or more.

Before passing to my last point, I would like to pay tribute to the spirit that has been manifest throughout this convention in all that affects the West, a splendid spirit, a spirit that is most promising, most encouraging. I take this opportunity of publicly thanking the business men of the other parts of Canada for the splendid way in which they have met the Prairie delegation.

During the very period in which the West was over-expanding its wheat production, the East was over-expanding its composite industrial plant. That is not true of certain individual industries: it is abundantly true of other industries and of the composite plant. Neither course was regarded at the time as a mistake. Throughout all Canada we took pride as Canadians in the fact that our export trade was being expanded to a point where we stood second among all the nations in exports per capita. But with the paralysis that developed in international trade, it became evident that we had over-extended ourselves, had failed to make due allowance for possible restrictions by other countries, and that this had been done industrially as well as agriculturally. As a result, there came from the industrial East demands for higher and still higher tariffs. Many advocated that there should be preserved for Canadian industry the entire domestic market. That point of view overlooked two things; first, that the prairie farmers can sell their products only to countries from which we are willing to buy in return; second, that prairie farmers having been forced to accept greatly reduced world prices, there is a limit upon what they can pay for that which enters into their cost of production.

May I recall to you for two minutes, that since the National policy was introduced in 1878, there have been great and far-reaching changes in the distribution of population, in channels and movements of internal trade, and in the geographical location of occupational interests. In 1878 more than 96% of Canada's total population was located east of the Great Lakes. It was very largely agricultural, only 14% being located in cities, towns and villages. Macdonald introduced his national policy primarily as protection for farmers, to provide for them a home market, so that they would be no longer dependent upon foreign markets over whose fiscal policies they had no control.

That policy in principle, although not in degree, had an appeal alike to rural and urban population of that time because the area of proposed industrial expansion had the same boundaries as the existing farm settlement.

How different is the situation today! The population west of the Great Lakes has increased from 150 thousand to approximately 3 million, from less than 4% to approximately 30%. It has been engaged chiefly in agriculture and, as already stated, must sell the bulk of its products in other countries.

This brings me to a definition of our great national task, as I see it. It is to evolve a formula that will permit and promote the full and concurrent development of each of the several parts of Canada without undue or disproportionate sacrifice on any other parts.

Those who know me will not expect me to present any cut and dried method; in fact, I am not interested so much in concrete details as I am in method of approach. If the method of approach is right, if it reflects the spirit of this convention during these four convention days, I have no doubt that we will be able gradually and in time to evolve that formula. (Applause.)

May I remind you that with every decade since Confederation it has become increasingly evident that this Dominion of ours is most fearfully and wonderfully made. That was true even as regards the original Confederation of the four Eastern Provinces. It has become very much more true of the Canada of today, with its far-flung stretch from Halifax to Victoria; with its three great natural barriers tending to divide our people into four widely separated groups; with its thinness of settlement from South to North; its great diversity of economic and occupational interest; its great public and private debt. Canada can not be governed on a basis of pure reason and pure economics. There must be at all times a readiness to take these varying factors into consideration, a readiness to recognize the inter-dependence of our various and distinctive parts, a willingness to give as well as to take. Above all, there must be kept in mind those great intangibles in our Canadian situation, those psychologies, those things of the spirit.

If all of this is done, there is no doubt, I repeat again, that we will be able to evolve that formula, and evolving it, we will be able to bring about that sense of greater national unity, that stronger vibrancy of national spirit that are the heart's desire of every true Canadian.

PRESIDENT J. H. BRACE: I am very glad whenever I see any evidence of anything which tends to bind Toronto and Montreal closer together. At our head table today we have a man I think in a very happy position: he is Montreal manager of the Bank of Toronto. He has been a personal friend of mine for some years. However, I have never tried him out by asking for too much extension of credit. Mr. James L. Carson, amongst many other things, is a very fine golfer, and while I should possibly not say it in the year 1936, he is still a bachelor. Recently he has been honoured by being elected President of the Montreal Board of Trade. I have very much pleasure in asking Mr. Carson to come before the microphone and extend the thanks of this audience to our guest speaker.

MR. JAMES L. CARSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir Henry, Ladies and Gentlemen: Having been the Montreal President of its Board of Trade for the matter of six days, it has been a great pleasure during the past three days to listen to the addresses given at our convention hall and at the gatherings so delightfully arranged by the various organizations of Toronto. These addresses have been given by leaders in our most important fields of endeavour, experts in the true sense of the word.

They tell a story of a certain factory having broken down and they had to call in an expert. The first thing he did when he came to the factory was to ask for a hammer. He started tapping. Inside of fifteen minutes he stopped and said: "There is your trouble." And it was. He went away and two days afterwards he sent in a bill for $250. Fortunately or unfortunately they had a Scotch book-keeper at the factory, and he thought he should ask for more details. The details came back—

"To tapping with a hammer $ 1.
"To knowing where to tap $249."

This Canadian Chamber of Commerce know where to tap. They have pointed out the weaknesses, and I think if the public will continue to hammer the proper way, with the great assistance of the press, we should have more efficiency in the conduct of our affairs, and there will be a greater opportunity for prosperity to follow.

Mr. Imrie is one of these Canadian Chamber of Commerce experts. He has been rendering outstanding service to Canada for a period of years. His reputation is equally as fine in the East as in the West, and it is my pleasure and privilege to extend to him on your behalf, most cordial thanks for his deeply informative and inspiring address.

WHAT AVIATION MEANS TO CANADA

AN ADDRESS BY HONOURABLE AIR VICE-MARSHAL W. A. BISHOP, V.C., D.S.O., M.C., D,F,C,

Thursday, February 13th, 1936

PRESIDENT BRACE: This is a particularly unique occasion, the first visit of the guest speaker to this Club, and I think on such an occasion we shall differ from our usual practice, and because he is a Past President of the Club, because he has written a biography of our guest speaker and because he has had very close relationship with our guest speaker during the last few years on matters of air, and others, I am going to ask Colonel Drew to take the Chair and conduct the meeting from this time on.

(Applause.)

COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW: Today we welcome here a great Canadian whose outstanding service to Canada and to the British Empire has been so fittingly recognized by his recent promotion to the rank of Air Vice-Marshal (Applause.) May I, on your behalf, take this opportunity of extending to our guest our heartiest congratulations on so properly becoming once more the senior ranking Canadian Air Officer.

On the walls of the beautiful Memorial Chamber in the Victory Tower at Ottawa, these words of Kipling's are inscribed: "They are too near to be great, but our children shall understand when and how our fate was changed and by whose hand."

Air-Marshal Bishop was one of those men who changed our fate during those years that meant so much to this Empire. He was the first British officer to receive the Victoria Cross, the Distinguished Service Order and the Military Cross, and they were pinned on his breast by our late King. Today, he has more decorations for valour than any living British officer. (Applause.)

I have no intention of attempting to recite events of that great career but there are two citations to which I would like to refer which do describe something of what he did in those years. The citation accompanying the award of the Bar to the Distinguished Service Order reads as follows:

"For conspicuous gallantry and devotion to duty while engaging hostile aircraft. His consistent dash and great fearlessness has set a magnificent example to the pilots of his squadron. He has destroyed no fewer than 45 hostile machines within the past five months, frequently attacking enemy formations single handed and on all occasions displaying a fighting spirit and determination to get to close quarters with his opponents which have earned the admiration of all in contact with him."

And at that time he had more victories to his credit than any other British officer and they decided he should be brought back on staff duty so his example might help in the development of the spirit of the Air Force, but in the early summer of 1918, at his own earnest solicitation, Colonel Bishop was allowed again to go back to the front. His trip there was very short and the citation which accompanied the award of the Distinguished Flying Cross, describes very briefly what took place in that amazing period at the front:

"A most successful and fearless fighter in the air whose acts of outstanding bravery have already been recognized by the awards of the Victoria Cross, the Distinguished Service Order, Bar to Distinguished Service Order and Military Cross.

"For the award of the Distinguished Flying Cross, now conferred upon him, he has rendered signally valuable service in personally destroying twenty-five enemy machines in twelve days, five of which he destroyed on the last day of his service at the front.

"The total number of machines destroyed by this distinguished officer is seventy-two, and his value as a moral factor to the Royal Air Force cannot be over estimated."

That citation tells an amazing story. There were only a handful of men who had more than 25 victories to their credit and this distinguished officer here with us today brought down twenty-five hostile aircraft in his last twelve days at the front. But more amazing than that is the information disclosed by his log book which was only recently examined for the first time since the war. It shows in bringing those twenty-five machines down in twelve days that he was only actually in the air thirty-six and a half hours. A German machine fell under his guns every hour and a half he was in the air during that period and so outstanding was his record that they then determined he should be brought back and his life preserved, for which of course we are very happy today. What would have happened if he had been allowed to stay there one can only guess but quite clear it is, he was the greatest fighting pilot the world has ever known.

(Applause.)

That is recognized outside of Canada and I found this written by a German, Von Gessler, in discussing Richthofen and then Colonel Bishop: "Bigger than the national fame that these heroes, friend and foe alike, won as patriots to conflicting causes, is the growing international recognition of their achievements, not as partisans but as men who gave to the world new and unpreedented examples of the highest form of physical and moral courage. Respect for human qualities of this high order knows no frontiers."

His achievements should be read by the youth of Canada today. Respect for human qualities of this high order knows no frontier. They should be taught that it was the spirit of sacrifice of men like Air-Marshal Bishop that made this nation what it was during those trying years. It is the encouraging of the same unselfish spirit of service to Canada and the Empire in days of peace that we must depend for the greatest hope of national regeneration in Canada.

Gentlemen, I have the greatest pleasure in introducing to you, Air Vice-Marshal Bishop.

(Hearty applause, the audience rising and giving three cheers and a tiger for Air Marshal Bishop.)

AIR MARSHAL BISHOP: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: I am completely overcome by the warmth of your reception, particularly referring to those days that are really so far gone that most of us have forgotten practically all about them.

I am proud to say that I am not a stranger to this Club. This is the third time that I have had the honour of addressing your members and today I have the particular pleasure of having my friend, George Drew introduce me. With reference to Colonel Drew, I would like to say that all Canadian flyers today are extremely grateful to him for the continuous energetic work that he carries on in support of our aviation problems in this country.

In speaking on a subject so broad as the future of aviation in Canada and the present position of the industry here, my difficulty is really in condensing as much as possible a vast amount of facts and material into as few words as I can. I feel that you will forgive me if I miss, is my review of this situation, many important angles bearing directly upon its destiny. But I will try to put before you the position in which we stand in Canada today as regards flying. This is a comparatively new industry which is obviously all-important to the development of our country, and one which, I am sure you will agree, has been sadly neglected. It has been neglected in spite of the most encouraging start and reception by the public of this country while it was still in its infancy.

I do not want to delve too far into the history of flying, because you all know it so well, but I would like to remind you that the first heavier-than-air machine ever flown within the vast boundaries of the British Empire was flown in Canada by a Canadian, John McCurdy, at

Baddeck, N.S., on February 23rd, 1909. This, in itself, was possibly more significant than anyone realized at the time. It was only a few years later that the Great War occurred, and one of the most astonishing results under the impetus of war was the number of Canadians who joined the naval and military branches of the air services, which later were merged into the Royal Air Force. From such figures as are available I understand that nearly 20% of the pilots in the Royal Air Force at the end of the War, qualified and in training, were Canadians. This was out of all proportion to the number of Canadians in other branches of the armed services.

My reasons for bringing up this point are purely to submit it to you as evidence that we are not a country, mentally, physically or morally opposed to aeroplanes. Twenty years ago we were a country whose people, and whose youth in particular, were keenly interested in flying, and if that was the case then, we can take it as an accepted fact that today with a greater understanding of aviation, with its development from the point of view of safety and reliability, with its possibilites for the adventurous spirit, we are still a nation keenly interested in flying.

The question of aviation is, to the lay mind, divided into two distinct classes, military and commercial. I hope to be able to show you that such a definite line of division does not, and cannot exist. In point of fact, it does not exist between the navy and commercial marine business. A lot of us like to close our eyes to certain facts, but we well know that the policy of all great naval powers has always been, to have their merchant marine service organized in such a way that it is a potential auxiliary naval force. Now, gentlemen, the same must, and does apply in the air, and it is also, as far as the European situation is concerned today, one of the most controversial points with which the diplomats there are trying, at this moment, to contend. However, in speaking to you today, I feel I can marshal my facts more clearly if I break up my thoughts into those two categories, military aviation and commercial aviation. But I hope you will bear in mind that all I say in favour of the development of military aviation has a bearing upon the development of civil aviation, and all that I say in favour of national support for the development of the commercial side has a strong bearing on and connection with the question of national defence.

Now, first of all, let me speak of our national defence problem. This is a matter which, most fortunately, has not had to be seriously considered for over 100 years. We have, of course, sent expeditions across the seas but we have never, in that period, had to consider seriously the defence of our own country, and sometimes when we look at the map and see our railway lines, two of them, stretched from coast to coast we think, "well, what is the use of national defence anyway," because, if we were attacked, it would only be by either our cousins to the south, which is most unlikely, or by our nephews and nieces, the Eskimos to the north, and they appear to be very happy where they are. So we say to ourselves, why should we bother, for if we were attacked from the south, it would be physically impossible for us, regardless of what our national defence programme was, to defend ourselves. That has hitherto been the case, but, with the rapid development of communication, including flying, times have considerably changed. We are not an aggressor nation and never will be, but we have two possibilities of getting into war-like trouble.

Either we might be involved in an Empire war or, if a great war occurred in which the British Empire was not involved, and no one can deny that such possibilities do exist today, it is quite conceivable that our neutrality would be threatened. On each of our coasts we are very vulnerable. If we do not have protective and offensive forces, which cannot be built up in the matter of a few months or even a few years, our neutrality could be endangered to the point that it might bring us into a diplomatic or more serious incident, the results of which no one can foresee.

What is Canada's aviation policy today, bearing in mind what I have said about the possibilities of war? Unfortuntely there is only one answer. We must admit the truth, we have been drifting, and from an aviation point of view we are not in the picture at all. Today Canada prides herself on national status. We have a country 3,000 miles wide, covering a vast expanse of territory with unprotected shores on the east and on the west. What have we done within the last eighteen years to build up a force, either on land or sea, which could protect our own country in case of war? Because we well know that the Mother Country would have her own hands full, and would be fully occupied looking after her own interests if any war started, involving her or not. She has her trade routes to protect, over the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. That being the case, it is Canada's problem to look after her own position.

We have our own trade routes. We have our own ports, and again I say, that serious thought must be given to protecting them, both in the unhappy case of war, and also in the very possible case of Canada and the Empire trying to maintain a neutral status. Neutrality requires protection almost as much as a nation at war requires defence.

In order to clarify the position of so-called military aviation today, it is necessary to review the short but intensive history of military aviation in the various countries, particularly of Europe.

So far as the United States are concerned, they are strongly in the picture. Ever since the War, France has followed the policy of maintaining a large air force and, regardless of cost, of producing machines in large numbers continuously and scrapping them as they rapidly become obsolete. Russia has followed the same general policy, if anything on an even larger scale. In Germany, of course, the position is entirely different. Under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, any military aviation programme which Germany would like to have followed was virtually dammed at the source. Her answer to this was to develop a very fine commercial fleet, which can, of course, be altered to suit military purposes at a moment's notice. This gave her one way of training personnel, but she also developed the art of gliding and soaring, which had a great appeal to the youth of Germany and, as a means of getting them interested in aeronautics, it cannot be excelled. In this way also, she developed large numbers of potential airmen. In the last few years, you all know that she has taken advantage of her trained men and has openly armed in the air.

Italy, on the other hand, while for a long period maintaining a large air force, spent a great deal of her money upon research, more or less copying the English policy. She, however, has also lately, like all the other powers, armed in the air to the fullest extent.

England, after the War, cut her air force to the minimum and every cent that could be spared was turned into funds for the purpose of research. The result has been that England has broken world record after world record for speed and reliability in the air. Although until recently lamentably short in numbers, her equipment was definitely superior to that of any of her neighbours. She was ready for the time which has now come, when she would have to put those designs into mass production. Although far from being the largest air force, there is no doubt in my mind that the Royal Air Force is the most efficient in the world, both from the point of view of machines and men; and the training of these men is one of the most difficult problems that has to be faced.

In referring to this particular point, that is, the attention Great Britain has paid to highly trained personnel, I am going to speak of what I think is the most important issue affecting Canada, in so far as assisting the Mother Country in case of another war. To understand this, I must picture to you again, the difficulties which we had at the end of the last War in transporting troops and materials. I have no figures to give you as to the number of ships which were torpedoed carrying materials from this side to the other, but, as we all know, it became nearly a question of starvation for the British Isles. My only personal knowledge in connection with such things as torpedoes was when I was taking my bride back to the other side in February, 1918, when, the evening before we landed in Liverpool, our gallant enemies celebrated my honeymoon by sinking three of the sixteen ships in our convoy, off the coast of Ireland.

If transportation of troops by ships was becoming as difficult as that eighteen years ago, it would be obviously impossible of accomplishment in the event of another general flare-up in Europe. What then could be our part in a European conflict in support and in defence of our Mother Country? It could only be specialized equipment and a quota of highly and efficiently trained air personnel. This, I am sure, in such an event, would be the only contribution we could make. Now, gentlemen, that is not an easy contribution. It might bring a breath of relief to a lot of people who have in view the same vast armies being shipped over the seas, but it is a very difficult thing to do without proper preparation.

The reason is that the increase in efficiency of military aircraft has reached a point where sheer racing machines of seven years ago are having their records challenged by military machines, fully armed, now being turned out in mass production. It will, I know, interest you to hear of one machine, a fighting machine, that is in mass production in England. It is a single-seater fighter that cruises at over 300 miles an hour, fully armed with machine-guns and capable, in power dives and other manœuvres, of very much higher speed. This is a result of the British policy of intensive research during and after the War, and the fact that details of the machine and of its performance have been made public property will be, I think, a strong deterrent to any aggressive thoughts in the near future of any European nation.

Here then, we have the perfect aircraft, and how perfect I can tell you from my own experience. In my war-flying days, the fastest machine that I ever flew did 130 odd miles an hour. The first one I was in when I was on an observer, had a top speed of 60 miles an hour, on good days. My point is that the development of these machines now requires a development of the type of men who are going to fly them.

The standard of physical fitness and training required is more exacting than that of a highly trained athlete. Medical authorities at the Air Ministry in London have proved that the vast changes of pressure in changing height or in turning, at 300 miles an hour, throws the blood away from the brain and induces temporary faintness or unconsciousness. Even the tests carried out nowadays for army machines are a great physical strain upon the pilots. As an example, I can quote the case of an American test pilot in a power dive at Wright Field some time ago. The effect of the steep dive and getting out of it, broke blood vessels in his brain and ruptured his intestines. He was confined to the hospital for a year and may never be well enough to fly again. In other words, to fly these super-fighting machines, pilots have to be most carefully picked and most carefully trained, not over a period of a few months but over a much longer period.

Now such training is necessarily an expensive thing. On the other hand, one well-armed machine flying 300 miles an hour would have been worth 100 of our best machines in the last war. Therefore, my point is that our contribution, if ever we are called to make one, should be one of quality rather than quantity. It should be a small highly trained force to meet the new conditions, and, as I said before, our country is obviously well stocked with such potential pilots.

While being very far from having any alarmist ideas, I feel that we cannot close our eyes to the possibilities of war in the near future. We have all seen how little it takes to start one and how quickly, once started, it develops. The situation in the Mediterranean is one fraught with danger. I am told on good authority that last Autumn, in connection with some military and naval manœuvres taking place around Malta, some old obsolete munitions were destroyed, including a number of depth bombs which were taken outside the harbour of Malta and exploded, by destroyers. After these depth bombs had been destroyed a number of Italian submarines rose to the surface. Well, picture the situation if one of them had been close enough to be damaged or destroyed. That would have been what they call an incident. Mind you, I cannot vouch for the veracity of that!

I do not think it is fully appreciated what aircraft can do now in the way of attacking. I am not referring to dropping bombs or spraying gas, which we can all visualize, but I am referring to a greater menace from the naval viewpoint. As an example, an attack upon a small fleet of, say, four or six vessels would be carried out with, say, fifty aeroplanes, each carrying a torpedo. Diving from a considerable height, they come within 14 to 20 feet of the water at a distance of anything up to half a mile from their targets and drop their torpedoes. It is necessary for them to come close to the water to launch them; otherwise, if they are dropped from too great a height there is the danger of them exploding on impact or taking a downward course through the water and going straight to the bottom. On the other hand, if the aeroplane comes too close to the water and then drops its torpedo, the splash from the latter striking the surface is so considerable that it has been known to throw up a column of water just in time to strike the tail plane of the machine and turn it over. After it has been launched, the torpedo then follows the line that it was dropped on. It is impossible to believe, if fifty are launched at half a dozen ships, that none of them will reach their targets. Of course, a number of the attacking machines would be shot down in the effort, but that happened in any operation in war. You cannot make omelettes without breaking eggs, and no battalion ever went over the top without losing a part of its number; and the same applies to air tactics.

Summing up, therefore, our position so far as a future expeditionary force is concerned, I believe that in the event of European trouble our most valuable form of co-operation would be highly trained air personnel.

Then let us look at the position we are in today with regard to making this contribution. The equipment which our air force has I prefer not to discuss at all. It is old and inadequate. Now, how do we stand for personnel? No Canadian can complain that we maintain too strong or large an armed force, both permanent and militia. We all know that in proportion to our size and our population it is the smallest in the world. But small as it is, the air proportion is ludicrous, both from the point of view of actual numbers and as a percentage of the whole. The figures of this all-important branch of our forces are staggering. Let me give you the actual figures as they stood roughly three months ago. We have, including our naval, permanent force, militia and Royal Canadian Air Force, a total of 56,608 officers and men, of whom 1,227 are officers and men of the Royal Canadian Air Force, permanent and non-permanent. From the air point of view this is all out of line, and I do sincerely plead that our Government devote, in fairness to Canada and to our position in the Empire, more adequate funds for the development of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

Let us turn now to the commercial picture. Aviation is most certainly one industry that owes nothing to Canada. Every cent that our government has spent on it has come back many times over. It has developed our country in the last few years in a way that would have been impossible otherwise. It has fully established itself in the minds of those people who live in, or are associated with, our northern areas. It was not so long ago when people believed that the only way to develop a country, or discover what was in it, was to build a railway or a road through it. All this colossal expense has now been spared. Every part of our country is now open and accessible. Yet, to be frank, we, a country that with the possible exception of Russia needs more from aviation than any other country in the world, are in a position vastly inferior to any other country of our size or population. We read in the papers from time to time about some individual pilot carrying serum into the icy wastes of the Arctic or some other spectacular thing of that sort, but the very fact that we are amazed shows the singularity of such an event. We have a few companies operating in the north under great difficulties, with no subsidies of any sort, and doing fairly well. But our development is so slow compared with that of any other country that it is a disgrace.

Every other major country in the world is spending large sums of money upon the development of air mails and communications. As a country we have done nothing, and we cannot much longer ignore the beckoning finger of progress. Even today the trans-continental railways are losing business on this account. Many people, leaving from the east to go to the west or vice versa, now go to the United States in order to be able to fly across on one of their most excellent services. From the press we have learned that Great Britain, through its major organization, Imperial Airways, is anxious to establish an air route to Canada to connect with a trans-Canada service and the Orient. I know that they and prominent members of the British government are determined they will have a faster communication to the North American continent and that if we, as Canadians, do not do something about a trans-Canada service, they will be forced to do it through the United States; and, of course, the United States are anxious to have it there. This must not be allowed to happen.

We are such an important part and link in our Empire that we must maintain our position. Again I repeat, Canada has never spent any money on aviation that has not been amply repaid.

One of the greatest difficulties is that, although I am sure from the past that we are an air-minded race, the average Canadian, leaving out the north country, sees an aeroplane so seldom that he still regards flying as a dangerous sport or experiment. In the north, where it is an integral part of the lives of everyone, they have become so used to it that they travel by air in preference to any other means of transport, although it is still expensive. These costs should, I feel, be reduced; but the only possible way to reduce them until flying is more firmly established here, is by some direct or indirect help from the government.

It was only a few years ago that the thought of a trans-Atlantic service was considered to be a remote possibility. Now the British government is spending literally millions of dollars upon three experimental machines for Imperial Airways to try out in 1936 and 1937. The United States are spending a matter of $6,000,000 on one seadrome which is only an experiment. The big cities and municipalities in the United States are spending millions of dollars on civic aerodromes and they find that it pays.

I am not advocating wild expenditure, but I am trying to point out that we, in Canada, are sound asleep in flying matters and that flying is part of the natural progress of our time and we cannot ignore it. While we continue to ignore it we are losing trade and profit.

In Northern Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba, in the north-west territories and British Columbia, private enterprise is developing our national resources and is using the aeroplane extensively, not only because it supplies the fastest means of transportation, but because it is safe and dependable. It can go where other forms of transportation cannot penetrate. It saves time. The people in those territories, right up into the Arctic Circle, rely almost entirely upon aviation for means of communication, obtaining supplies, and everyday business. It is quite true that large areas have been opened up, but private enterprise is responsible. In this work the aeroplane is the handmaiden of industry. Canada has built a series of landing and emergency fields across the Dominion, but is it not a fact that these were built as a relief measure rather than as a matter of national policy, Again, have these been built on the scale that the country deserves? Here we find a country, wider than the United States, in which we have not one transcontinental air service, while south of the line six or eight services a day are operating to the coast and have been doing so for years. We have spent paltry sums on building landing fields, but a recent route across the Pacific Ocean cost the United States government, on ground equipment alone, $10,000,000.

True, we have seen the first steps toward a trans-Atlantic service in the agreements recently reached at Ottawa and Washington, but this is merely the connecting link. The various political units of the Empire must maintain their own interior arteries of air transport if the British Empire is to maintain its place in this new phase of transportation, which has already become one of the most important means of carrying passengers, express, and valuable freight. In this development Canada has a peculiar interest which we cannot escape, because of our geographic location.

We are on the shortest route between Europe and the Orient and with the inauguration of the trans-Atlantic service, there is no practical difficulty in the way of direct flight from London and other European capitals to the Orient via Canada, in a much shorter time than can be accomplished across Europe and Asia. Canada is the natural route between Europe and the Orient, with all its possibility of auxiliary services along the line. If we are to avail ourselves of the opportunity nature has given us, we have no time to waste.

It is hard for us to realize, because we see from our windows so little flying going on, what is occurring in other countries, but as an example in England in 1935, last year, $25,000,000 was subscribed by the public for new commercial aviation companies. The youth of England, the youth of all the great countries, is keenly interested in flying. We have only to look at the news of the last few weeks to realize how safe air transportation is considered in Europe. His Majesty King Edward flew, as you all know, from Sandringham to London after the late King's death. It was one of his first acts and, therefore, I think, can be taken to have some significance. It doubtless was startling to many people, but I know that I, myself, feel safer in the air in good weather than motoring on the average main road. (Applause.)

To most of us who used to fly during the war, the present aeroplanes are something that we can hardly understand. In the words of the aviation press, the engines today are referred to as being 99.99% reliable, and here is the key to the progress that has been made—reliability. In those early days when one flew, one's heart beat with the engine and a miss of one cylinder meant a miss in your heart. We never flew with any feeling of confidence in our engines because we had too many let-downs and forced landings. Now they are referred to as 99.99% reliable and that about sums it up.

Other aspects of the new designs have improved, in much the same way that automobiles have improved. Motors are now easy to drive and easy to steer, and the same applies equally to aircraft. A little over a year ago, after not having touched the controls of an aeroplane for twelve years, I decided to try it again. I really, on that trial, was not seriously considering taking up active or energetic flying as a pilot. I was amazed at what I found. I went up with an instructor from the Montreal Light Aeroplane Club and he told me to take over the controls when we got up in the air. I proceeded to try some drastic evolutions and the machine laboriously obeyed. The pilot in the meantime was shouting down the telephone to me not to be so ham-handed. I was, in my imagination, again flying some of those war machines that required a lot of strength and determination to make them do anything. He then informed me that all I needed was a touch on the controls and that, in normal flying, the machine would practically fly itself better than I appeared to be able to. It was only a few minutes before I had the touch and feel of the machine. It enthused me to the point that I forthwith had little further instruction and applied for a flying license. What's more, I got it! (Laughter and applause.)

To those old pilots who still in their hearts have a secret love of flying, although in some cases they will not admit it, I would like to say that I sincerely hope that some day they will find themselves at the controls again and I promise them a delightful surprise. It is probably one of those few things that can be taken up later in life, that one can do as well now as in one's youth.

The question of municipal aerodromes is today a vital one in Canada. Here is Toronto, one of the finest cities in the world, without its aerodrome. Why can you not fly east, north or west out of Toronto by a scheduled air line? There is no airport here for such a line to use! Why is there no regular link between Toronto and the great air lines operating just south of you? There are no facilities at this end for such a link, Why do Torontonians not hear the drone of arriving and departing aircraft every day of their lives? Because there is no airport! It is hard to conceive of a city as prosperous and important as Toronto not having a municipal airport, fully equipped for night and day flying.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that, in spite of the fact that eighteen years ago 20% of the flying personnel of the British Empire were Canadians, the people of Canada are singularly unaware of the safety of modern flying and the absolute necessity of adequate air services and proper landing grounds throughout this country.

It will be my earnest endeavour, and I feel it incumbent upon me in view of my new rank, to do my utmost to further aviation in Canada. And I take the opportunity now, if I have in any way made you feel the importance of the situation, of bespeaking the support of all those who are listening to me today. (Hearty Applause.)

COLONEL DREW: I know that every one in this room will agree that the speech to which we have just listened is one of the most interesting and at the same time the most significant that the Empire Club has heard for a great many years. (Applause.)

Eighteen years ago, in His Majesty's citation for valour, it was stated that Marshal Bishop was of the greatest moral value to the Royal Air Force because of the services he had rendered. I predict that the announcement he has just made that he proposes to devote his time and his very considerable energy to furthering an interest in aviation in Canada will mean that he is going to give service to Canada which will be as great to the future of this country as the services that he gave to the country so splendidly during the War.

On behalf of The Empire Club, on behalf of all who are here today, I extend to you our heartiest thanks for the speech you have made and the hope that you may have every success in the efforts you propose to make to further a real and active interest in Canada in the cause you have so much at heart. (Applause.)

JOTTINGS FROM AN EXPLORER'S NOTEBOOK

An Address by CAPTAIN CARL VON HOFFMAN

Thursday, February 20th, 1936

President: Yesterday, when I had an opportunity to talk with our guest speaker, I assumed that adventure and romance were associated with the life and the life work of an explorer. Captain von Hoffman, on the other hand, assures me that work such as he carries on is of too serious a character to leave anything to chance and adventure comes through leaving things to chance. Looking over the life of Captain von Hoffman I am inclined to think it has been rather equally divided between adventure and romance. He was born in Russia and at the age of fourteen years he ran away from home to join the Russian Army in the Russo-Japanese War. He was, apparently, even at that age, quite a factor in that war for he was noted for gallantry and was presented with the Order of St. George. Shortly after that he came to America and in the United States became a newspaper correspondent just previous to the Great War and he was in Mexico during the disturbing times down there. When the War broke out he returned to Russia and acted in the Intelligence Force of the Russian Army until the United States came into the war, when he transferred to the forces of the United States Army and in 1918 he went over to Siberia and fought with the Russian White Army.

Captain von Hoffman has carried on explorations in very many parts of the world. He has spent approximately fifteen years in Africa studying the customs of the primitive races in that continent. He is recognized as an anthropologist and has completed what is probably one of the outstanding accounts ever brought out of Africa and Asia, dealing with the mental, physical and spiritual aspects of those primitive races.

Captain von Hoffman is Chairman of the Speakers Committee of the Explorers' Club, an organization which does not include in its membership any arm chair explorers. They are all noted men, both today and those who have gone on, who are members of that group. I name such men as Captain Scott of Antarctic fame, Sir Hubert Wilkins, Admiral Byrd, Lindbergh and our own Captain Bartlett and Stevenson.

Captain von Hoffman will speak on "Jottings From an Explorer's Notebook." (Applause.)

CAPTAIN VON HOFFMAN: Mr. Chairman, Honoured Guests, Members of The Empire Club: This is indeed a privilege to speak to you. I did not prepare a particular address. I thought, since I have been given this great privilege, of addressing you on a subject, "Jottings from an Explorer's Notebook." I have made quite a few jottings.

If I may first speak of our Club, the Explorers' Club, perhaps you all know the name really is a misnomer and it is an association, an educational institute, recognized by the Government, which only men who have done things in the field of exploration may join. We also have a few associate members but the active members must be explorers who have done work in the different departments of science. We have a medal which we present for outstanding work and the last medal was presented to Mr. Bertram Thomas for work done in the Arabian Desert. He, of course, is a Britisher. We have had also such men as Captain Scott and Shackleton who were well beloved by us. In our Club rooms you find a wall dedicated to the immortals, as we call them. Their pictures and their names and their records hang there and all we who do work hope that some day when we go beyond, we may have the honour of having our pictures on that wall.

There are many Englishmen, many Norwegians and there are people of practically all nationalities who have been recognized for exploratory work. Naturally, like all explorers, we don't recognize a man's nationality so much as the man he is. Those of you who have been out in the open know what a great human friendship exploring of the wilderness creates in a man toward men. This is where you can find if a man is genuine, if he really is the person you have known in the city. We must realize that in the city we are continually in touch with other people. No matter, even if we live with the individual every moment of our life, there is something else that makes our eyes wander. We are continually moving about in contact with other people and in spite of being associated with one person, he doesn't tax us with his individuality, with his mind, as much as he would in a lonesome place where all his idiosyncrasies become known to us and ours to him, where every little bit of motion that he makes might irritate us or might leave us placid. That is how we begin to know men.

That reminds me, I have in my studies of human beings even applied that to our own modern world, as far as women are concerned. We take a young lady and we court her. After we marry her we wonder that she finds herself unhappy with the man she has married. In this modern age she saw the man, she went out with him, they were continually together, but they were just going to dances, out riding, seeing things and very little did they realize that they weren't learning to know each other. And that is exactly what can take place on the veld. After you find yourselves alone you find disappointment and therefore it is well to know whom you go out exploring with just as well as whom you marry.

I am going to take your time for a moment, if I may, on the advance of modern, I may say, our modern behaviour through the world. I maintain as an anthropologist that time is short. We want those who are interested in our work to help us because within another twenty years, and that is a liberal time, there won't be anything left that we may study of primitive men. Remember that the primitive men or what we call the savages, are the present representatives of our ancestors. They are those who still give us a page for that human history of the descent of man, and unless we have time to go before aeroplanes, modern ships and automobiles encroach upon these primitive people, we will lose our valuable pages. We also must recognize that even the inroad of civilization has brought to these people diseases which have destroyed entire groups of primitive men. We have our illnesses, our diseases to which we have become immune. We can survive them, they cannot, and you know many of them have been destroyed by just that contact. Now, we must work if this is of any value. Some people say, "What do we care what the other fellow, the savage, lives like?" Oh, we care a lot. Those are irreparable records, and records that we can never get, once they are gone. Every day as we sit here they change.

Let us, for instance, take even such a modern country as Japan. Let us look at Japan today. I lived in Japan and studied the Japanese. Their customs are fading. You can go to Tokio and you can't tell Tokio from Toronto, except that you see a few Japanese and what we are coming to right now is that the only difference between people in different countries will be not the country, but the language. That is all, because our behaviour becomes the same. Even the Japanese, the Oriental, who used to be so polite, who bowed at everything, who in fact was ashamed or afraid to smile because it might offend you. This reminds me of when a Japanese boy came in. He giggled a little bit and held his hand in front of his mouth and I said, "Yes, yes, what is it?" and he said, "I want to ask you if I may have a day off. Ha, ha." I said, "What are you laughing at?" "Honoured Sir, my father died," and he smiled. That gives you an idea. Of course we don't realize why he does that. He doesn't want to burden you with his sorrow. Therefore, he pretends to smile.

Now, take the same man who has been taught from generations to be a polite individual. Japan is the most hospitable country in the world; take the same man and get him in an automobile, what does he do? As soon as he gets in the car, every mannerism is gone, he will crowd you off the road just as much as a New Yorker will or anybody else. So, you see what the car has done. The machine has made of us the rudest people in the world. If we were to walk on the street as we drive we would probably get into a fight every minute of the day.

I have spent most of my time, of my life, when I could, with primitive people. My closest associations with primitive men have been in Africa. I am going to take the negro with whom I have lived. I am not trying to show you that you are lesser or he is lesser as an individual or a human being, but I am going to show you that he *is a human being.* I will give you actual facts, rather than generalities.

Let us take our efforts to make a Christian of the native. I am going to take you to a place in Northern Rhodesia. It is in this part of Africa that the Lala tribe lives. That is a race of the Bantus which predominate in South Africa. Here, I found my cook boy, Kosamu, who was very friendly. He was my right hand man, anything I wanted he would do. Kosamu said to me one day, "I have talked to the missionaries and they want to make a Christian out of me and I like it." He said, "I am going to become a Christian." I said, "That is excellent, Kosamu." He said, "Here is something I want to ask. They told me I could be baptized." "Sambashiad" he called it. "I have to be dipped in water, but I must first get rid of my wives. I have three wives. Now these wives cost me four cows. I have just recently bought a new wife. She is very nice. Now, I can't make up my mind which wife to keep—the others I am going to send back." I said, "I can't help you Kosamu. Can't you decide which wife you would like to keep?" He said, "Well, the elder women not so good to look at any more, but they have the knowledge. They can make very good food. They can cook, they can make beds, they know how to patch the roof of the house, they know how to plough. This young one doesn't know anything practically yet and not very good in cooking." I said, "You can't get me into this, Kosamu. I am not going to decide what wife you should keep. You decide for youself." He stood there a while and then he said, "Well, I guess I will cook myself." Then he went out and asked for a day off and I gave him the day off. He disappeared and went to the village. He came to his mothers-in-law. He had two. He wanted to sell his two wives back to the mothers-in-law. That was all right. You see they have a matriarchal form of government, practically. The woman is the owner of the child, naturally the child is her own and the mother-in-law is the one that brings up the child, and the father has practically nothing to say about the child. That is all right. He wanted to get rid of the two wives and all he was interested in was to get something back for the four cows that he had paid twenty years ago for his wives. That was all right. He came there. He was not permitted to look his mothers-in-law in the face. When you get married you must never look your mother-in-law in the face. I think it is really a good custom, because they always have to talk into space. They can't talk to you. So, we find Kosamu sitting in front and his two mothers-in-law in the rear. They say if a son-in-law looks his mother-in-law in the face she splits in half, so if he sees her coming down the road, she or he will hide, so they won't see each other. No matter what you say, they won't take any chance.

Kosamu said, "I have come to trade my wives back." They said, "Yes, that is very nice." "Now, what are you going to give me for her?" They thought a while, "Well, you had them a long time." "Well, how much you give me?" They finally decided they would give four chickens for each of the wives. That was the exchange. He came back to me and he said, "I can't become a Christian. I can't afford it." The cost was too much. (Laughter.)

Now, I am going to try another little thing on you gentlemen. Many of you have read books and have heard of the great mysteries of the African drums. I always revolt when I hear the hoaxes that are perpetrated on people, intelligent people. Of course, they have no way of checking up, but you hear people come out of Africa who, perhaps, have spent a little while there and they tell about the mysterious war drums, how the drums sent signals ahead of time and word to the people that the white men were coming and the natives cleared out of their villages. That is all very well, this kind of signal, but in the first place they attribute to these people a code. They can't even read or write. So they give them a signal code. That can't be because there is no such thing as dots and dashes with primitive men who can't spell. The true version of it is that these men who hammer on the signal drums, which are about four feet long and two feet high, are supposed to produce a noise that sounds like their language. That is what they argue, the people who tell you they heard these drums. Now, that is all very well, but they are sending messages across Africa, they say. The funny part of it is that the man who lives in this part of the veldt is of one tribe, and can't speak the language of the other tribe. How can he read his messages?

There is still another silly thing. They even say you can hear these drums. I recently read a book where the man says you can hear the signal drums for ten miles. Now, Gentlemen, if you shoot a gun, could you hear it ten miles away? It takes a pretty good gun or cannon to sound ten miles away and it is very unlikely with a little gun. That is what you are given to believe. Africa hasn't got that. There is a little drum and they can pound out certain words. They have preconcerted signals about danger. They have a word if they are in need or to call, but not languages, not so they can converse with each other or insult each other by calling each other names across the boundary.

I happened to be in Africa in 1924. I took, as a guide, an expedition across from Cairo to Capetown. When we began our journey, the conditions were rather troublesome. They had killed the Sirdar, Sir Lee Stack, at Cairo, and the Egyptians were on the go up the Nile to start trouble. I was one of the white men Sir Geoffrey Archer, who became the Governor-General of the Sudan, permitted to come across from the capital of Sudan, Kharteum, to the town Lord Kitchener captured, Omdurman. He permitted me to cross the Nile at the time the sheiks and all the rest were coming down to swear allegiance to the British Flag. I happened to be one of the foreigners who had the privilege of going there. It was rather a ticklish time. The Governor himself would not allow his wife to cross. There were machine guns and arms in readiness because they didn't know whether the men were actually going to sign allegiance.

There where the White Nile begins I met Captain Fergusson. Captain Fergusson was the Native Commissioner up as far as the Dinka tribes, and he controlled the whole Nile section. Every year in the month of February, the early part of it, the Commissioner goes down and collects the head tax from the natives. He came to the Nuer tribes who are on the Nile, at a place called Hilet-Nuer. When he got there he found that the natives instead of being friendly were all sitting around and he noticed that there was some feeling that things were not right. He went to the Chief and said, "Have you collected the taxes?" The Chief answered, "I have collected them but I am not going to give them to you. If you want taxes, you go and get them." The result was the natives began to run for their spears but Captain Fergusson managed to get on the ship and get back. At that time I was coming along the Nile and ran into a steamer going up the Nile, carrying two machine gun platoons, one in command of Captain Chudlow Roberts, and the other in charge of a Bimbasha, or Major, Robertson. These two men were sent up the Nile to see what they could do. They took me along on the boat. I had to promise I wouldn't take any pictures which I was willing to do as long as I could see what was happening. One disembarked to the north of the Nuer territory, and the other one went south and disembarked on the Nile front. There they found a high plateau, so they placed their machine guns and waited. While we were coming up we could see the natives' fires. We could hear the natives singing and the fires were burning rather high. When we got there we could see the cattle were lying exhausted on the ground. They cut the jugular vein of the cattle and drink of the fresh blood to give them courage and make them wild. This is the first sign when the native goes bad, as we saw they had done. The chief or the king of the tribe was not only a king but he was a witch and that makes him a trouble maker in itself. He rules by two powers. He rules by his power as a king and as a witch. Because of magic forces they fear him so he can instil any ideas into these primitive people. He told them that the white men would come and not to fear the white men because he could neutralize the effect of the white man's fire stick, meaning the gun. In effect, he would turn the bullets into clay. That was brought back by the Ashkaries who went up to the natives and talked with them.

So, 'Bimbasha' Robertson conceived an idea. He said, "We have to make this man believe actually in his own witchcraft. That is the only way we can destroy him." From our cigarettes we took off the tin foil and made clay bullets. Then we took out the lead bullets from the real shells and moulded them into the shells—when they were ready they looked like lead bullets and we told the men to drop a few on the ground where the natives were going to find them. They would see a shiny bullet and we knew what the consequences would be. They did find it and they ran to the Chief and the Chief picked it up as soon as he got hold of it and of course it was mud and it crumpled. "There," he said, so he believed in his own magic.

The men stood up for a while and as soon as they were convinced the bullets were mud, he led a charge against Robinson's group and of course was met with a charge of machine gun fire that killed, I think, about 300 of them. The rest cleared into the veldt. The white man's punishment is by confiscating their wealth, that is the cattle. They have thousands of cattle. So the government took the big herds of cattle and put them on their barges and took them north again. That was the beginning and the end of the first uprising where the witch actually believed in his own magic; he was killed himself in this uprising.

We thought perhaps this was the end of it but in 1927 I was coming down the Nile and too late—I didn't see my friend, Fergusson any more. He became very friendly with the younger generation of the tribe who began to take on the white man's ideas. He tried to dispel all the witchcraft and the control of the witch doctors over the men. He tried to give them ideas and break up the witch ridden group of human beings. So his ideas became really very interesting to the tribes. He used to come down and sit around with them. They would sit on the ground in the circle in front of a fire and listen to him. He could speak their language thoroughly and they were very friendly to him. The old men who were losing their power said, "This is not so good. This man is taking away all our power, all our craft, because by our witchcraft we held position and the people paid us. Now, we are losing all that."

They got a hold of one man and told him to throw a spear at Fergusson. If Fergusson's medicine was so strong and powerful, it would protect him and, naturally, they would say, the man is mad, and they would kill the young native boy who threw the spear. If he killed him, naturally, there would be no fear because he had no power anyway.

Now, if we make one mistake sometimes and we can't correct it fast enough, we pay with our life. As Fergusson sat there a spear came through the air and landed beside him. Instead of letting it go and laughing it off, he became enraged and grabbed the spear and threw it back and missed his assailant. When they saw that he also missed, they killed him. Fergusson had done very fine work, particularly as an army officer. He did fine work and he wrote several brochures. I have some of the legends and the stories and fairy tales, as we may call them, that Fergusson wrote of these primitive people, which give you as you read them an idea of the background and the customs of the forefathers of these men, stories that can always be deciphered. He did fine work. Work that is really a monument to him and a great contribution to science, but he paid with his life. Of course, the Nuers paid for it later on. The authorities sent planes over and bombed them and burned their villages. I haven't been up there since 1927. They are probably gathering back again. So, you see, there is a little adventure you can't avoid even as an explorer. There are interesting little happenings in our life of course, there are many things that are strange in Africa, but one thing I know, you can travel through British Africa, you can travel through that great continent, you can enjoy in that great country the friendship of men you come in contact with. You know you will get all assistance; you won't be looked upon as a spy. You won't be treated with suspicion. When you go into any of the other countries as a scientist, particularly when you have a military title, they think you couldn't come for any other purpose than spying. In Portugese Africa, if you came in and tried to do any work the officials are crooked, they try to steal from you, try to get graft. In other countries, in Belgian Congo, the little officials are overzealous. They try to do everything to annoy you, to get every bit they can as duty and everything else. They are not the congenial fellows one meets in South Africa.

The native Commissioner, who lives in a population with perhaps twenty whites, when you arrive will meet you with a glad hand. You bring out your phonograph with your jazz records, and his wife comes out to see that you come to dinner—you might have a bottle of Scotch—and you will have the grandest time. I always long to get back to my good old friends in British South Africa.

I thank you. (Applause.)

President Brace. After hearing Captain von Hoffman, I can't help but feel that next to being an explorer such as he is, being an arm chair explorer for the course of half an hour is a real treat. I am sure I am expressing the appreciation of all present when I say to Captain von Hoffman that we are pleased indeed to have him here, we have enjoyed very much indeed this very interesting address. (Applause.)

STRATOSPHERE EXPLORATION

AN ADDRESS BY CAPTAIN ALBERT W. STEVENS, AIR CORPS, U.S.A.

Thursday, February 27, 1936

The President, Mr. J. H. Brace, in the Chair.

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, in our modern life, preceding the known design of any particular device, we find years of work carried on by scientists, by physicists, by research engineers. There is a small group of scientists who for some few years have been making studies of the stratosphere. As far as I know, the only time the stratosphere has been used, really, for transportation was during the course of the big war when shells from big Berthas landed on French soil some thirty miles distant. There is now, however, hope that at least in the sub-stratosphere use can be made for the transportation of passengers and express over distances now far apart and at a speed such as we at present do not visualize. Among this group of scientists we find our guest speaker of today, Captain Stevens, who has been associated with three flights, the last of which occurred on November 11, 1935, when he and his assistants rose to an altitude of 13.7 miles, the highest altitude yet attained by man. (Applause.) As the result of that work and the scientific data which they were able to collect, Captain Stevens has received from Washington the Gardner Green Medal. His flight was carried on under the auspices of the War Department and of the National Geographic Society in Washington and I presume many of you have seen something of that, particularly if you have had an opportunity to read last January's copy of the National Geographic.

I think it is most timely to have this address of Captain Stevens's succeeding by one or two weeks the very marked lecture that we had from Air-Marshal Bishop, as I think there is a definite association between the thoughts of the two men and the work that they are carrying on in this particular field. I have much pleasure, indeed, in presenting to you Captain Stevens. (Aplanse.)

CAPTAIN ALBERT W. STEVENS: Last year, and the year before, the National Geographic Society and the United States Army co-operated to put into the air two great stratosphere balloons—by far the largest ever constructed. Because of previously unknown factors in the design of such enormous balloons, the first one ripped in flight and finally exploded; we, in the gondola, had to jump for our lives. Another balloon was built, and it burst while still on the ground. Fortunately, our sponsors still had faith in us. We discovered the weak places in design, repaired the balloon, and finally flew it last Armistice Day to an elevation of 72,395 feet. This flight was entirely successful, and we returned to earth with many films and other records of performance of instruments at very high altitude.

The advantage to be gained with such very large balloons is that one may carry standard size, comparatively heavy, instruments into the stratosphere. Our load of instruments was over a ton. Balloon, gondola, instruments and ballast weighed 7½ tons at the time of takeoff. The balloon envelope, or bag, weighed over three tons, and when it filled out it was nearly 200 feet in diameter, with a volume of 3,700,000 cubic feet. At sea level this enormous balloon would have lifted much more than a hundred tons, had it been filled. But we filled it less than seven per cent full, and this comparatively small quantity of gas swelled and swelled as we rose, until it filled the bag and then overflowed through openings in the bottom of the bag. When we stopped rising, we were in the air only 1/25th the density of air at sea level.

We remained at this elevation for nearly an hour and a half; our instruments, which had been operating automatically from the time we left the ground, continued to function, and many of our best records were obtained in the time spent at the very top of the flight.

At this elevation each of us in the gondola weighed a pound and a half less than when we were on the ground four hours earlier. Of course, we were not conscious of this change of less than one per cent in weight, but it was theoretically there, and one of the instruments we carried indicated this small change. We were nearly 14 miles from the earth. To reduce our weight to one half, we would need to go nearly two thousand miles away from the earth's surface, which is, of course, impossible. That introduces the question that is sometimes asked us—"Some day aeronauts will go so high that they will start going the other way. Is there any probability of this?" There is no such probability, for it is calculated that an object must be shot out from the earth's surface at a truly tremendous speed—over seven miles per second—before it can escape the gravitational force of the earth. Such a speed has never been attained, or even approached, by our very largest guns, and it is not likely that guns will ever give this great speed to a projectile. With rockets it is doubtful, even theoretically, that this speed may be attained. Certainly, practically, there is no hope, for no certain means has been found to guide rockets on a straight course upward, and no material is known that will stand the terrific heat of the rocket flames for the time necessary to pass through the earth's atmosphere.

Airplanes have attained 47,000 feet, and are not likely to go much higher, except for a few possible thousands of feet, at increasingly prohibitive cost. The practical limit for high altitude flying, commercially, seems to be 30,000 feet. It is quite likely that the next year or two will see airplanes, built with air-tight cabins, flying at 30,000 feet for distances of six hundred to a thousand miles. At this elevation they escape storms, and are above most clouds. To go higher is unnecessary and costs too much in fuel and time. The pressure in the cabins of such airplanes will not be sea level pressure, but will be adjusted to a reduced pressure that a cabin will stand, and still permit the passengers to be comfortable.

That is exactly what we did in the gondola of our balloon, the Explorer II. We had an air pressure corresponding to that of a mountain 13,000 feet high. We were able to work in comfort. Actually, we only knew that we were surrounded by air extremely cold and 1/25th normal density, by our instruments.

At sea level scientists calculate that 30 cosmic rays per second pass through our bodies. At our elevation there were thousands per second passing through our bodies. The instruments we carried registered the number and the direction of these rays. If it were possible for a person to live for weeks at this great altitude, it is possible that the effect of this increased radiation might be harmful. On the other hand, at sea level, they may be beneficial or even necessary, to human life. No one knows at present. The total energy from them is not as great as popularly supposed, and at present scientists are more concerned in discovering what they are, and what causes them, rather than how they may be used.

The purpose in flying in the stratosphere is not primarily to get as far away from the earth as one can. It is rather to get up to an elevation where there is as little air above you as possible. There is a considerable difference between the two purposes. In other words, we wanted most of all to get to an elevation where radiation from space is coming in without being checked by a great mass of air.

Stratosphere flying, for many scientists, is to obtain data on cosmic radiation and on the amount of ozone present at high elevations. Stratosphere flying, from the view point of the Bureau of Standards and the United States Army Air Corps, is for the purpose of getting additional data on the temperature of the air, and the pressure at elevations reached as compared with measurements of the same elevation by means of aerial cameras.

In making the flight it was best not to concentrate on one line of work entirely, and so we decided to take all the apparatus that could be furnished by leading scientific institutions of the United States and to do as many things of scientific interest as possible.

For instance, we obtained samples of the air during the time of our highest elevation. Each of the two samples consisted of nearly six gallons. When six gallons of this very rare air, under only 1/25th of an atmosphere of pressure, is brought down to earth, it amounts to less than one quart under our normal pressure. These two samples represent the only sizable samples of air that have ever been captured at such a height above sea level. Their analysis has been completed by the National Bureau of Standards, by G. N. Shepherd. The studies indicate that the composition of the stratosphere air is almost the same as that of air at ground level. Very slight differences have been found, but their significance has not yet been established.

With the cosmic ray apparatus furnished by the Bartel Research Foundation of The Franklin Institute it was found that the intensity of radiation increased steadily up to 57,000 feet where it became 55 times as strong, from the vertical, as at sea level. At the maximum elevation of over 72,000 feet, the vertical intensity decreased to 42 times. The extraordinary thing was that it was found that at the highest elevation almost as much radiation came in horizontally as vertically. At the earth's surface practically all of cosmic radiation comes in vertically.

The study of the amount of ozone that is present in the atmosphere is tremendously interesting. Up to a few years ago it was thought that ozone existed largely at very high elevations, beginning at 25 miles or more above the earth's surface. But now, from the investigations of Professor Regener and others it is believed that ozone exists at much lower elevations. Two spectrographs were taken along on our last flight; one on the outside of the gondola and one on the inside. These instruments were designed and built by the Bausch & Lomb Optical Company and fitted with cameras made by the Folmer Graflex Corporation.

The atmosphere not only holds back cosmic rays but holds back a certain amount of sunlight. The shorter waves of sunlight apparently are responsible for the formation of ozone in the atmosphere. The changes in the spectrum of the sun as these instruments rose higher and higher were recorded photographically on ultra-violet sensitive film, especially coated for the flight by the Eastman Kodak Research Laboratory. The cameras of both instruments automatically made photographs of the spectra and at the University of Rochester and at the Bureau of Standards measurements are still being made showing the extension of the short wave end of the spectrum as the altitude increased. Dr. Brian O'Brien and Dr. F. L. Mohler point out that the balance of ozone in our atmosphere has a tremendous influence on life as we know it. If ozone were rare, we would be sunburned by a few minutes exposure to the sun. If ozone were more, then we would probably die for lack of essential vitamins. Also, it is likely that there would be an enormous increase in bacterial growth on the earth's surface which might be fatal to human life. It is evident that the small amount of ozone in the atmosphere is a very important regulator of life on the earth's surface. At the altitude reached by our balloon 20 per cent of the total ozone of the atmosphere lay beneath the balloon.

An apparatus made by the Department of Terrestrial Magnetism of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, D.C., measured the change in the electrical conductivity of air from the time the balloon left the ground until it attained its highest elevation. Ionization of the atmosphere grows greater as one rises above the earth to a region of greater cosmic radiation. The more the air is ionized, the more easily it conducts electricity. From the measurements of Dr. O. H. Gish and K. Sherman it appears that the conductivity of the air became 81 times sea level value at 61,000 feet and at 72,000 feet the recorded value was 50 times the sea level value.

The apparatus of the National Broadcasting Company functioned perfectly through the flight and the signals from the 8 watt transmitter in our gondola were received all over the United States. Above 60,000 feet the signal strength decreased somewhat and so far there has not been any satisfactory explanation for the phenomena. Not only were our outgoing signals well received, but we heard perfectly the conversation from the National Broadcasting Company ground station. Had it not been for the noise of the many instruments operated in the gondola, and for small difficulties caused by audio feedback in the confined limits of the gondola, we could have talked as easily as over an ordinary telephone.

At the top of the flight, the sky became very dark. Our instruments showed that the intensity of sky light was only 10 per cent of that at the earth's surface. To the eye the sky was almost black with a touch of very dark blue. It has been difficult to describe exactly the appearance of the sky. The nearest I can come to it is to compare it with the appearance of dark blue cloth under the rays of a quartz mercury vapor lamp.

The light that comes from many substances, on which ultra-violet light is shining, gives such substances a somewhat different appearance than when viewed under normal conditions. For instance, on the flight of the Explorer I, we noticed that the ropes which went up to the balloon had an unusual phosphorescent glow, and at times these ropes appeared larger than normal. Possibly water vapor was coming out of the ropes under the reduced pressures of our higher elevation. What we saw perhaps was the sun's light on minute quantities of vapor. At times clouds of smoke appeared to roll by the windows of the gondola. This, too, may have been vapor coming from ballast sacks, battery boxes, ropes, or parachute bags.

We received a letter from Mr. E. A. Klarup of Burke, South Dakota, who stated that he, and several other residents of Burke were watching the balloon through field glasses. While they were watching there suddenly appeared what seemed like quite a heavy smoke around the balloon. Several of the party saw this and some even remarked that the balloon might be on fire. This was at approximately 12.05 Central Standard Time when the balloon was almost due west of Burke, perhaps a trifle north of due west. It is estimated that the balloon was then approximately 100 miles west of Burke. The field glases used were eight power. The sky was very clear with not a cloud in sight. Since several persons saw the same phenomenon, it is likely that there must have been something unusual. From our view point inside the gondola we were not aware of this general effect.

Looking up through the upper window of the gondola we could see only the rigging and the lower surfaces of the balloon. We photographed with a National Graflex Camera loaded with DuFay color film, the balloon and the sky beyond it. These color films, when developed, showed that the sky was darker than the dark blue field of a large flag of the United States that hung in the rigging.

Our coldest temperature was at the very top of the flight, but it was not very much colder than it had been at 35,000 feet. On the day of the flight of the Explorer II the base of the stratosphere was apparently at 37,000 feet, for it was here that our instruments recorded an inversion of temperature. The temperature had been dropping from ground level until it reached -57 degees C. Then it rose to -55 degrees C. Then, as we rose higher, it dropped very slowly indeed to -62 degrees C. It will be seen that the great drop in temperature occurs in the first 35,000 feet. The next 35,000 feet gives very little difference in temperature. This region, the stratosphere, has been called the iso-thermal region, or the region of nearly constant temperature. It is probable that if we could ascend several miles more that the temperature will get slowly warmer, and if we could go another fifty or one hundred miles, it is then likey that the air, at least in the daytime, would prove to be very hot. Some scientists have estimated the temperature of the air at extremely high elevation as being hotter than boiling water and some have estimated that it is at the temperature of melting brass. Because of the extreme thinness of the air at these elevations, and its consequent lack of mass, it is not likely that water will boil, or brass melt, in the period of a half day at these elevations. However, a thermometer of very small mass would perhaps record such great temperatures if we could only send such an instrument to very high elevations and leave it there for several hours. There seems no way to do this, so the matter will probably remain one of speculation. Even if we could shoot rockets very high, some of the instruments carried would not record because it takes a certain length of time for them to register. Barometric readings would also be difficult because of the pressures generated by the travel of the rocket itself. Furthermore, since instruments are rather delicate it is doubtful whether any of them would survive the shock of the start of the rocket.

The frequency of the outgoing signals from the balloon was 13,050 kilocycles. The incoming signals were received on a frequenly slightly over 6,000 kilocycles from a 200-watt transmitter located by the National Broadcasting Company at Rapid City. During the flight we talked to the giant China Clipper, an airplane flying over the Pacific between San Diego and San Francisco. We conversed with Captain Edwin C. Musick and with William Burke Miller aboard the airliner.

Miller arranged for us to talk to a newspaper in London and we were still talking to the newspaper man in London at the time we were forced to open the portholes at about 13,000 feet. We were descending at the maximum speed we dared to drop and had to open the portholes at a time when the outside pressure of the air exactly balanced the pressure inside the gondola.

Captain Anderson did a great amount of valving from 75,000 feet until the balloon got about 40,000 feet. Since the sun was shining on the bag, the balloon tended to absorb heat faster than it radiated heat. Consequently, unless gas was valved it refused to fall.

But once we got to 40,000 feet conditions changed. At this elevation the air was still as cold as it had been higher up, but the air now began to have appreciable mass and, consequently, as the balloon fell through this air of greater density, still -57 degrees C, it served to cool the sides of the balloon as the balloon descended. Now the gas inside the balloon began to cool and shrink and very quickly we began to pick up speed of descent. Captain Anderson no longer had to use the valve, but instead began to drop ballast. This was easily accomped with our electric device for discharging ballast on the outside of the gondola. We also discharged some fine lead shot through a trap inside the gondola. Later, we dropped batteries on parachutes by pulling steel pins on the inside of the gondola that released the batteries hanging on the outside. When we got the portholes open, we cast out on parachutes our air conditioning apparatus, which we no longer needed, and our supplies of liquid and compressed oxygen. The problem of Captain Anderson was to keep the descent below a velocity that would cause air currents to whip the bottom of the bag to a point where tearing might occur. He was very skillful in doing this, and at no time did the fabric whip to an alarming degree. Our later descent was about 600 feet per minute at a maximum.

When we were quite near the ground, we could see the lanes of dust caused by the automobiles of many people who were trying to follow the balloon. Some of these people were within a few hundred feet of the balloon as it landed. We shouted to the motorists to drive ahead, jump out and catch hold of the drag rope and thereby stop the balloon. Could we have induced twenty or more people to grasp the rope, the balloon could have been brought to a stop, in which case the helium could have been released gradually through the valves in the top of the balloon. In that event we would not have needed to rip the top of the bag in landing. But either through misunderstanding or because they were fearful of the great mass and pulling force of the balloon, the motorists refused to grasp the rope.

Consequently, we looked ahead for a clear field. Ballast was thrown out in small quantities to keep the balloon from settling to the ground until we were approaching a good field. Then the balloon was allowed to settle slowly to the ground. We were drifting at about ten miles per hour. We donned the football helmets loaned us by the Rapid City School, stretched a safety belt across the gondola, and then as the gondola nearly touched the ground, we pulled together on the ripcord. The top of the bag instantly opened. It deflated so quickly that the gondola turned over on its side. Hanging to the safety rope we swung to the centre of the car, while objects of all descriptions that had been on the floor, hurtled by us. We groped around with our feet and found that we were standing on some of our instruments. It was a matter of seconds to get outside and find that the balloon itself had fallen in the direction of the wind, laying itself out as perfectly as one could wish for. The balloon was not injured except for the opening at the very top. It could have been repaired and could have flown again, but the National Geographic Society and the Army Air Corps decided that it was best not to use the same bag for another flight, but rather to cut it up. The previous plans had been to fly the Explorer II in July with helium and to fly it again in September with hydrogen. Due to the failure caused by the rip panel in July, 1935, the flight with helium fell in November, leaving no further opportunity for a flight with hydrogen the same year.

If another flight ever is made by us, we would still choose the Rapid City location because of the natural protection against wind furnished by the Stratobowl. We would use hydrogen on another occasion as the recent flight shows that this gas can be used successfully under the conditions of the last flight. We would like some day to go up again to a much greater altitude. It seems possible, according to computations by the Bureau of Standards for a balloon carrying men to fly as high as 95,000 feet. Of course, if we carry as much apparatus as we did on the last flight we must be satisfied with a few thousand feet less. It seems better to be content with somewhat lower altitudes and bring back a quantity of scientific data, rather than to make a flight just to see how high men may be carried. We could have achieved a higher elevation on the last flight had we gone lightly loaded, but we are better satisfied that the flight carried so many instruments that have added to the store of information of scientists. (Applause.)

President Brace: There are a number of men in this audience that go up in the air with lots of less preparation than Captain Stevens found necessary, but I think if, like Captain Stevens, you are going up over 13 miles in the air you will require considerable preparation as well. I know we have all listened enthusiastically to the remarkable address and we have enjoyed immensely the pictures that Captain Stevens has brought with him to show us more clearly just what was done and what was necessary in order to carry out this flight.

To Captain Stevens on your behalf, I am extending our very heartiest thanks for a most interesting address. (Applause.)

THE COUNTRY DOCTOR IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

An Address by DR. ALLAN ROY DAFOE, O.B.E.

Wednesday, March 4th, 1936

President Brace: Your Honour, Distinguished Guest, and Gentlemen: We are highly honoured today in having as our guest, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. (Applause.) We have met to pay tribute to a very distinguished Canadian citizen. I do not think I am saying too much if I say that probably no man has ever done as much as Dr. Dafoe to increase the esteem and good will of the people of the world toward the family physician. (Applause.) It is our good fortune at this time to have as our Lieutenant Governor a man also distinguished as a great Canadian physician. (Applause.) Accordingly, it does seem very fitting that on this occasion, as the Lieutenant Governor of the Province, and also as a very distinguished physician, that the Honourable Dr. Bruce should introduce our guest speaker today. I have much pleasure in calling upon the Honourable Dr. Bruce.

Honourable Dr. Bruce: Mr. President, Distinguished Guest, Gentlemen: Ontario is probably the best known Province in the world. (Applause.) There are five reasons why this should be so.

I can recall a film which was produced before the days of the talkies which was called "The Birth of a Nation." From what has subsequently happened in Callander, I suspect that Mrs. Dionne also saw that film, and that she accepted it as a personal challenge.

I think some of us must feel a certain amount of sympathy for Mr. Dionne. For, after the event about which you have all read and heard so much, the trained nurses appeared at the home and they commenced to clean up the rooms and when he first returned after this renovation he knocked on the door of the room where his children were and asked if he could come in. The nurse looked at him and said, "No, you musn't come in here. You have not been sterilized." The poor, unhappy father walked away, murmuring, "You tell me."

I think perhaps we do not all fully realize the wonderful achievement that has happened within our own borders. In looking up the records of quintuplets born during the last five hundred years, we find there are only thirty-three recorded cases. Of that number, one group lived for fifty minutes. One member of another group of five lived for fifty days. No group, and no individual of a group survived more than those fifty days. And we recall that when these children were born Mrs. Dionne had one child under one year of age so that at one time she had six children under one year of age.

I am glad that we have with us today a gentleman who comes from another Province which has been very much in the public eye. I refer to the Minister of Health in a former government in Alberta, Mr. Hoadley. I am rather curious to know about the truth of a story I recently heard and perhaps he can tell me whether it is accurate or not. It is stated that on the backs of the new bills which the Social Credit government has issued they have the words, "I know that my redeemer liveth."

I want to pay a word of tribute to the wonderful service of Dr. Allan Roy Dafoe during the first few very critical days of the life of these children. I don't think any one appreciates the situation quite as much as we of the medical profession, the hazards which they ran and the marvel that a general practitioner with his skill and devotion to service could anticipate difficulties and troubles and relieve those troubles when they arose and save these little babies, little mites of children, until further help could arrive. It was not until the fourth day that his brother, Dr. William J. Dafoe of Toronto went to his assistance with tanks of oxygen and carbon dioxide to assist the children to breathe when they refused to perform that very necessary function for themselves. And for a period of two months gas was inhaled by them at intervals during critical periods of siniosis, resulting in saving them from imminent death. (Applause.)

You all know about the great work of the staff of the Children's Hospital in securing mothers' milk for them which was supplied to the children from the end of the first week as long as they required this milk, in abundant quantities.

Then, we have to pay tribute to the carefully balanced diet of a scientific character which has been developed during the last fifteen or twenty years, and I should say that no small credit for that splendid work is due to the head of the Medical Service of the Children's Hospital, Dr. Alan Brown. (Applause.)

I am sure that Dr. Dafoe would wish me to remind you that even the quintuplets have a father and a mother and I am sure he would be the first to admit that even his great skill, of which no praise is too high, would have been of no avail if those little mites had not begun life with a priceless legacy of a sound constitution. In their parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dionne, we find that hardy French stock with that pride of race and devotion to the faith of their fathers which have so long characterized Canadian pioneers of all races and in all generations. All honour to them and may they find in the renown which has come to their famous offspring a satisfying and resounding tribute to themselves.

The medical profession, not only of Canada but of the world is profoundly grateful to Dr. Dafoe for his marvellous achievement. He has had recognition by being made a life member of the Academy of Medicine, Toronto; of The Ontario Medical Association and of the Canadian Medical Association. He has appeared before the Academy of Medicine in New York and all that the medical profession can do has been done to honour him. As you all know, he was honoured by His Majesty, the King, on New Year's Day, last, an honour that was very richly deserved. (Applause.)

Dr. Dafoe is the son of Dr. William Allan Dafoe, who practised fifteen years in the town of Madoc, so he comes by his medical lore honestly. He, himself, has practised for twenty-six years in Callander. I think we can regard Dr. Allan Roy Dafoe as a typical example of everything that is best in a general practitioner and those of us who know the enormous value of the work which general practitioners do throughout the country only wish that we had many thousands more Allan Roy Dafoes. (Applause.)

I have very great pleasure, Gentlemen, in introducing to you a man who, if not the father of the quintuplets, at any rate is responsible for the fact that those quintuplets are still alive and flourishing.

(The audience arose and gave three hearty cheers and a tiger for Dr. Dafoe at this juncture.)

DR. ALLAN ROY DAFOE: Your Honour, Mr. President and Gentlemen: I am indeed honoured today and I wish to thank your President, Mr. Brace, for his invitation to be present at this luncheon. Mr. Brace, incidentally, gave me a phone in the early days between the hospital and my home so in case of emergency I would always be there. Not only that, but we have no public phone in the hospital and that saves all these reporters—if they do not get the information they sometimes would like, it comes through me.

Naturally, my chief interest in life for the past two years has been the quintuplets who were born in Callander and these babies we regard as the fairy princesses of Canada. And, without fear of contradiction, I can perhaps say I know more about the quintuplets than anybody in the world, but when they asked me in New York and other places how they make them, that is another matter. I was at a Leap Year Dance the other night.

I don't dance, but I was there. And all the beautiful young ladies, they came to me to enquire—I had nothing to say though.

I would like to make acknowledgement to the Ontario Government for the help they have given me from the time the babies were born. The next day I asked for relief. We had nothing — not enough to eat in the house, no nurses, nothing and their Relief Officer came along and authorized me to do anything I wished. We put in sanitary conditions—they hadn't them—we clothed them, got new beds. You take five babies coming to a home already overcrowded—it's no fun—coming all at once. But all the way through, the Ontario Government have stood behind me. It didn't matter whether it was the Conservative Government first, or the Liberal Government that succeeded them, and I wish to thank them all, especially the Minister of Welfare. The Canadian Red Cross, inside of twenty-four hours, came to my help. They secured me a nurse. I wanted another and they got another. I had three nurses and I had an orderly whose duty it was to keep on fires all night. I had maids. I had an establishment. They maintained that work for the first year. It cost them some money. Good advertising, though! But think how the service was granted freely and without cost and I have had experience with the Red Cross outside in Ontario and they have done wonderful work. Take the girls, travelling dog team, any way they could in the woods. They deserve a lot of credit.

The Sick Children's Hospital — Dr. Bruce spoke about that. You remember they started with one pint of mothers' milk a day. When they were five months old they were using a gallon a day. Of cow's milk, that is nothing. Of mothers' milk, that is considerable. They had to go around and collect the milk and pay for it. I believe they paid the mothers ten cents an ounce. It cost that to the hospital. Then it was sterilized and sent to us. It was checked on the railway as carefully as gold. They would wire along the line that the milk was on the road—in case the train was late or something. They did that all the way through.

Then, I had the services of Dr. Brown with his wide experience, Dr. Robson and many others. I remember one day last year, some of the children were sick. Dr. Brown, you know, is a busy man. I told him my trouble and inside of fifteen minutes he made a midnight trip to Callander. (Applause.) How's that for a famous man like Dr. Brown? It helped me anyhow.

Now, the medical profession throughout Canada has stood behind me. They have given me everything, anything I wished, in the way of advice and experience. I have had the co-operation of the University of Toronto and, incidentally, we all arranged services. I don't know everything. I know babies—at least, I know five babies. But about teeth and the specialties of children, the training of children, I have to seek advice. If I like it I take it; if I don't, I don't (Laughter.)

Now, I wish to say something about the children, as to why they lived. Dr. Bruce has very properly drawn attention to the French Canadians. Their heritage is great and they are very proud, and I think have some reason to be so. They come from the old Normandy pioneering stock, not very much education but still they have that health. The girls marry young—they avoid a lot of infection by doing it and they commence quite early—Mrs. Dionne was only seven and a half years old when her mother died and she looked after her father's family. When she was sixteen she married and lived quite a peaceful life until—.

Then, you take that country up there. The north country has been well advertised. Every time I go to the States I tell what a wonderful place it is—fresh air, no infection, or very little. Take over half the confinements up there, there is no doctor in attendance—just the neighbouring women. The doctor is called when they get into trouble, that is the only time. With the kind of practice

I have or that any country doctor has, he is perhaps the friend of the family. In fact, they confide in him more than in their priests. They come and tell him things that perhaps they are ashamed to tell the priest. And when he is stuck he comes and talks to me. And when I do not get along well, I talk to him.

I remember the time we had the influenza epidemic. I had a lot of people to look after. I went to all the local priests and told them what I would like. I wanted fresh air, sunshine, complete rest. It was a good time of year—it rained all the time. The priests went around daily and where there was no fresh air they opened the windows. They went back next day and if the windows were closed they took the windows and hid them in the barn so they had to have fresh air. As a result, out of about eighteen hundred cases, I lost six. (Applause.) But that is only common sense though, and these priests were as much responsible for that as I was.

Now, we will talk a little bit about the birth, the early stages. They had two nurses, women from the country, one the mother of, I think, eighteen or twenty children. I have forgotten how many the other had—I think, ten.

I would like to speak about the parents. They have had a hard time. I feel sorry for them. They had lived quite peaceful lives—the ordinary French Canadian home. When he was stuck on the farm, she would help him, bring in hay and so on. When she was stuck in the house, bringing up babies, he would go in the house and wash dishes and so on. They worked together. They were quiet people, never went any place and to have this misfortune drop on them.

Well, anyhow, you can understand what a very difficult position the fellow has had and the mother, too. It was so bad in the first few weeks that they had to hide in the barn, run away. People broke in the front door, in the back door, looked in the windows. We had to have police on guard constantly. It was enough to break anybody's spirit, you know and it was bad. Then advisors would come along and tell them to do this and do the other. The parents would listen—they didn't know who to believe. They don't know who to believe yet. It is a very hard thing.

I want to point out these people are good people. They are very good stock. I feel sorry for them. Just now we are working along very peacefully and we hope to continue.

I thought maybe you might be interested in the size of the babies at one time. When they were five days old they weighed around a couple of pounds apiece. At one day, the whole five of them weighed nine pounds and three-quarters—nearly a pound and a half each. When they were five days old their length was thirteen inches; chest, eight and a half. You know that is pretty small. Their wrists and ankles, an inch and a half in circumference. Imagine how small that was. They were the smallest babies I ever saw. They looked like premature children—those enlarged, what I call abdomens, and so on, bulging eyes.

We went along, we had quite a time the first few days. Everything at logger heads. One, perhaps, fortunate thing, was I was able to control the situation. I think the only reason was that I was a country doctor and the people had faith in me and there was no interference. If I had made a mistake, it was just too bad—that was my mistake. If I got away with it, that was all right, too.

Now we had everybody—the Red Cross came along. Mr. Alderson whom I see here today, represented the Red Cross and he was a tremendous help. Now, I wish to pay some respect to him. We had the babies in that old home and at one time that small home had between twenty and twenty-two people in it. Mr. Alderson came along and we built a temporary bedroom for the nurses some distance from the house and we began to consider the question of moving the babies. They couldn't stay long where they were, there was no sunshine in that place. The babies were a kind of greenish yellow. They were bound to die. For a while we all thought they would. As they lived hope began to rise and so we began to make preparations for the new home. At that time, to protect the parents from perhaps unwise exploitation a guardianship was established of which Mr. Alderson was one of the main men. He promptly got busy and inside of six weeks or so had a new home erected across from the old home and if it hadn't been for that hospital being erected in such a way, I am sure that the babies would have died. I think you ought to recognize Mr. Alderson. (Applause.)

Now, then, we had lots of sunshine and we were able to put the babies outdoors. They started getting fresh air. From now on the babies slept outside for four or five hours every day, ever since they were four or five months old. When it was cold in December this winter, dropping between 28 and 30 degrees below zero, they slept out of doors. I tell my American friends that in the States and they think it is kind of funny. They like that, the babies are so accustomed to being out that if they are not out they get peevish and won't eat. This last week or two we have taken them out on a toboggan and they love it. We dump them in the snow banks and they love it. We want to advertise the northern country.

The present situation is this. As you know, there was a Guardianship Act passed in March, 1935, in which the children were made wards of the King. We have never taken the children away from the parents. After all, those children belong to the parents. All we are doing is perhaps looking after them and giving them as good care as possible. The parents even now are over every day. The mother comes over and helps to wash them and feeds them and plays with them. I understand they feel, perhaps, sometimes they would like to do more. They will after a while. At the present time we are looking after all expenses and everything. Now, these children were made wards of the King. The Minister of

Public Welfare, the Honourable Mr. Croll, was appointed special guardian of the estate and person of these children. The other guardians are the father, a noted jurist of the north country, Judge Valin. He is French, honoured by both French and English and has the confidence of both races and he is known to be honest and a man of wisdom.

We have our problems. The Ontario men down south want to know what in the deuce I am doing looking after French Roman Catholic children, and the French up there want to know why I am running the show when I am a Protestant. The churches have been pretty good, though. The Catholics and Protestants have worked with me a hundred per cent. Incidentally, the parish priest comes to see the children every day. The babies pay him the same as other members of the parish. We teach them to say their prayers every morning and night. It is a habit, you know, they don't know much about what they are, but every morning and night they say their prayers. We are training the children to be French Roman Catholic children. Naturally, the parents are French Roman Catholics, and why shouldn't they be? (Applause.) All my staff is French. Any nurses are French, and we have chosen these nurses on account of their good French. We want to train the children to speak educated French. Therefore, the only language they understand is French. They speak a few words in French. It is garbled, but if you give commands in French they understand. We teach them to dance a little bit—just to educate their muscles.

Anyhow, the Judge up there has the confidence of both the English and the French. I don't talk French very well. I understand it all right. Naturally, a Frenchman likes to come and talk to another Frenchman, just as I would like to talk to another Englishman. I understand what he wants. He has the confidence of both races and any trouble that arises in a small way, the Judge takes it up. Then there is myself. I look after the odds and ends.

Now, all these guardians are not paid any salaries. We all serve free of charge. All our expenses in Toronto, all arrangements of contracts is done by the Minister of Public Welfare, free of charge. We thought it would be wise that way, because he is a business man. We don't want to be bothered by everybody coming along with this miserable little contract and that. We don't want to be bothered by that, so it comes to the government where they have lawyers and so they can pass it. All the contracts have to come before me. Somebody comes along with some soap, and I pass it up if I think it is no good. We don't allow anything which will do any damage to the babies. The babies come first and always. I said there was no salary to the guardians. That is true. I am paid a small salary as the medical officer, so much a month. I may say, we pay the parents a monthly income. They have five other children and there is no reason why they should be neglected. We hope to do more for them later. Just now, we hope to raise enough so the income from the money raised would be sufficient to keep those children. Remember, if one child should die the contracts are null and void and if we haven't enough money for the income to maintain them, it is too bad. The expenses are now between $1,000 and $1,500 a month. Our staff consists of two nurses, a housekeeper, a maid, two policemen. You know we have been a little afraid of kidnapping and besides, it is pretty handy to have men around with experience. We are appointing another policeman the first of the month. That will be three for the summer.

Now, there is no exploitation of these babies. I suppose in a mild way there is, we invite the tourists to see them and have contracts, but after all there is no exploitation and everything is under medical control. Everything is passed to Mr. Croll and the guardians meet regularly at North Bay once a month. They meet and pass all salary bills and keep the books and we know where everything is.

Now, as far as the tourists are concerned, we welcome the tourists as guests. We don't charge. We feel that is small stuff. True enough you would make some more money. The Americans can't understand that attitude. "Why don't you charge?" "Why don't you make more money?" "Put dog stands and everything around the place." We like to have things a little dignified. Besides, I have complete control. If at any time the children are sick, I am not going to show the children. If you invite tourists and make a charge and do not show the children they would say you were operating under false pretences.

Take the movie film. I only allowed them one hour. One day they only sat half an hour and all the filming was done in four or five minutes. The hour includes everything, but the babies come first, always. We welcome all the visitors. People all over the world have such an interest in these children. I think the world loves a baby. Multiply that by five and that it quite a bit and this interest, you know, is maintained even among men. Men go around hard-boiled and say that is all rubbish, but I get so much correspondence from men all over. One man, 78 years old, writes once a month to know how these babies are.

Now, I want to talk a bit about the babies. Just now their health is fine. It is pretty hard to tell them apart. If they are dressed up, I can't, because they look alike. Of course if they have not so much on, I can.

We had a little trouble with Marie for a long time. She had a sort of blood tumour on the leg which has been cured and she had a little tendency, perhaps, toward the eyes not being okay, more on account of weakness than anything else. At the present time her eyes appear normal, the ears are normal, the hearing is good. In fact, she is quite normal. She didn't get around as fast as the rest and she became impatient. The other four were walking well. Marie couldn't walk as well. When she finds she is left behind, she gets on her hands and feet and she goes!

Now, as far as feeding is concerned, we use ordinary things that any mother could use. But there is one thing we do use, that is cod liver oil. I remember when I first went to that country up north. The old fashioned scurvy was a common thing. You have read about it in books, about the ships travelling, the ancient explorers, and the teeth of the men would become loosened. I also had that every spring among the children in a mild form. There was no cod liver oil and fresh vegetables. Now, we have the people understanding better and I think on account of the babies it is helping everybody. You take the papers, people will read those newspapers, you know, and I must say they have been very fair to us and every day, as often as I can, I put out a little notice about how I think the children are. In fact, there are some parents and if their doctors don't do for their children exactly as I say, they go and remonstrate with their doctors. That is not fair. What is the diet for one child is not necessarily true for another. Still, I am just showing the interest that there is.

Not very long ago I toxoided those children. I know it is a very necessary thing for children. I did that partly for them and partly for the health institutions all over the world. People have been saying, "If it's good for the quintuplets, it must be good for ours." If you ever saw a child die from diptheria, as I have, you would take no chances.

Vaccination—we propose to do that shortly.

They awaken about five o'clock in the morning, from five to six. We give then some cod liver oil and orange juice and they drink that down. They play around and we put them in the bath tub. We used to leave Marie to the last but she got so jealous. She wouldn't take it.

She would yell, so now we take the children in rotation, one time, one, and another time, another. We put them in two at a time and when we get through we weigh them. We have to watch the weights, every week. If they lose three or four ounces people want to know why. We feed the children again at eight and they are put outside at nine. They sleep until eleven or twelve. They are fed and put out again and they sleep from one to three, and they exercise in between times.

Now, the children, as I said before, look very much alike. My idea is that they are identical babies. I am not a scientist, so I want to make sure first or the scientists will want to pull me about. This is experimental stuff, anyhow. We have plans for any eventualities. Last year we showed the babies, one at a time on the porch. We had a large fence and at certain times during the day we allowed people inside the fence. Last year we had around 375,000 people there. That is a lot. Perhaps fifty per cent were Americans. Some days, perhaps some seven or eight thousand people were there. We showed first one baby and then another. The babies didn't mind it but toward the latter part of the season they began to get a little restless and didn't like it. They have to have some privacy. This year, we are hoping to have a plan whereby the public can pass through and see the children at play without being observed themselves. We want as much privacy as possible. We hope, in fact we know we are going to do that. We show them between certain hours. We expect to have a great many people, perhaps half a million there this summer. Think of the prosperity brought to the Province of Ontario. Think of the gas tax alone. They have to pass by way of Toronto or Montreal or the Soo. It takes a day to go and a day to come. They spend another day or two and they buy things to take away—souvenirs. After they get to the north country they are usually so pleased that they stay a couple of days more.

Well, now, as far as the general outlook is concerned, I hope our efforts in caring for these babies will be of some value for the general infant welfare of our country. As far as the quintuplets are concerned, it would indeed be a wise man who could tell what the future has in store for these babies. These babies are not guinea pigs and will never be used as a basis of experimentation. Every effort will be made to keep them healthy and to give them proper surroundings during their growth period. I hope that the best traditions will be carried out as far as their race, their religion and their country. Thank you. (Hearty applause.)

PRESIDENT BRACE: Dr. Dafoe has spoken so feelingly about one of the original guardians, the representative of the Canadian Red Cross in that north country that I am going to ask Mr. Alderson to stand. (Applause.)

Dr. Fred Routley, Commissioner for Ontario of the Canadian Red Cross Society, has done a great deal of work in association with Dr. Dafoe in connection with the carrying on of health activities for these children. I am going to ask Dr. Routley to express the thanks of this gathering to our guest speaker.

DR. ROUTLEY: Your Honour, Mr. President, Distinguished Guest, and Gentlemen: When His Honour was speaking a few minutes ago he made the statement that Ontario was known throughout the world and particularly there were five reasons why that was so. A short time ago I heard a very prominent clergyman in this Province, whose particular field is our northern part of the Province and who for many years has been identified with the north country, make this statement on a public platform. He said, "the north country, God's country, where a man can go to bed at night the father of five and wake up the next morning the father of ten."

In a news item in the papers a few days ago, as a matter of fact, during the period when most of the rural roads of this Province were blocked with snow, you perhaps, most of you, saw a news item, I think two different news items which stated two different cases of acute appendicitis among farm dwellers were found and in both of these cases the patients were two or three days in their homes without proper surgical treatment because of the inability to get them to hospitals and in the one case, finally, after a ten mile trip over the tops of snowbanks and a trip of some miles to a hospital one of the patients was operated on to find he had a ruptured appendix. With the full knowledge, I know, of my distinguished friend on my right, I would like to say, if you studied the medical annals of rural Ontario during the past few years, you would find, if all the cases of acute appendicitis waited to be got into hospital for surgical treatment there would have been many hundreds of deaths where those people are today spared to live because of the knowledge and the courage and the resourcefulness of the men of medicine in the country who, when the patient couldn't be moved to hospital, found their way, frequently on foot over snowbanks in order to give the desired treatment and relief. That has not only happened once, but many hundreds of times in the history of medicine in this Province. (Applause.) And when I think of that class of men, when I think of the rural conditions that did obtain in this country fifty years or a hundred years ago, and when I try to visualize and compare them with the rural conditions which obtain in a part of our Province, which are exactly similar to the conditions which obtained in this part of the province 75 or 100 years ago, I recognize it is the rural men who are assisting more than any other class of men in Ontario to relieve the discouragements, the hopelessness sometimes, to relieve the minds of the pioneers in their times of distress, because sickness does come to these people in these remote areas. The men, more than any other class of people who have done most to relieve them have been the country practitioners in the far remote places and I would like to pay tribute to my friend, Dr.

Dafoe. He and I were class mates together in the University of Toronto. I admit I look many years older than he, but we were class mates, just the same. I want to pay tribute to him as the best kind of country practitioner, as the Honourable Dr. Bruce has already said.

The Canadian Red Cross Society had a little nursing station twenty miles east of Callander and for six years previous to the birth of the quintuplets, out in that little station we had a highly qualified nurse, a nurse, as Dr. Dafoe has already said who found her way to the pioneer homes of that district, frequently on foot, on ski, or by dog team or any other way she could go. I want to say that during that six years there was telephone communication between that nursing station and Dr. Dafoe's house, twenty miles away and there never was a time, the weather was never too cold—the weather does get too cold as some of you know, in that country— it didn't matter whether it was forty degrees or more below zero, it didn't matter whether the roads were impassable or not, that nurse told me over and over again, she never put in an urgent call for help by a physician, after she had sized up the situation and recognized that a physician must be had, never in vain did she put in a call for Dr. Dafoe. (Applause.) He was always ready to go, to go at a moment's notice, if some other case didn't hold him, to go, as I have already said, through impassable roads and through impassable, almost, weather conditions, and because of the resourcefulness of these men, because of the courage of these men, because of the knowledge which they acquire, because they don't, all these country men, spend their leisure time going to movies, they spend their leisure time, if they have any, reading the modern treatises on medicine and surgery, and all of the things that pertain to their profession, so, by and large, with the rank and file of the profession, I will put the country man up against the city man every time, and I think he will surpass him in his knowledge of medicine. He certainly will surpass him in his spirit of resourcefulness, because he has to do so many things without facilities, without any other personnel, even to advise him. And Dr. Dafoe has many, many times, in his experience, been faced with the condition where out in the country, far remote from any other medical man or anybody else in the world, he has been obliged as he was in the case of the quintuplets, to go ahead and do the thing as he saw it and trust to the result obtained. So, Dr. Dafoe, in the name of perhaps the finest cross section of the business community of this city which will ever be got together to face you, in the name of the cross section of business and professional men of this city, I want to pay our tribute of homage to you for the wonderful thing you have done, the unique thing, the thing, as Dr. Bruce has already said, that has gone around the world. A record has been set up as a record for many, many years, if not centuries to come which has never been accomplished before and which has made you a world famous man.

I want to pay tribute to you and to welcome you on behalf of this group and say, May you long live to bask in the reflected sunlight of what will apparently be a glorious future for five little girls who are destined to be the world's sweethearts in the days to come. (Applause.) ,

THE TRAIL OF '35

AN ADDRESS BY CHARLES CAMSELL C.M.G., LL.D., F.R.S.C.

Friday, March 13*th,* 1936

CHAIRMAN ARMSTRONG: On behalf of the Members of The Empire Club, it gives me much pleasure, indeed, to welcome our distinguished guests who grace our head table Those of you that are visitors know you are welcome—we are always glad to have you here. We leave the latch off the door in this Club in the hope that some day you will enjoy our company sufficiently to become members of it.

As our Constitution calls for the appointment of a nominations Committee at this particular meeting, it will be in order to receive that motion.

MR. DANA PORTER: I have much pleasure in moving that a Nominations Committee be appointed for the purpose of nominating the officers and executives for next year, to consist of the following gentlemen:

MR. J. H. BRACE,
MAJOR W. JAMES BAXTER,
MR. HUGH EAYERS,
MR. GEORGE C. GALE,
MR. R. M. HARCOURT,
MR. ARTHUR HEWITT,
MR HOWARD WEBSTER.

The motion was seconded by Mr. F. Beverley Matthews. CARRIED.

CHAIRMAN ARMSTRONG: Our mining industry, as you all know has reached very significant proportions in this country. It has undoubtedly contributed much in the last five or six years to the prosperity of Canada. It has been a most effective economic stabilizer in all our transactions and to give you some conception of the vastness and the ramifications of this particular business, it may be of interest for you to know that last year the entire expenditures of our mines equalled more than the total value of our exports to Great Britain of wheat, grains, vegetables and fruits. To give you a further conception of the vastness of the mining industry the total expenditure of our mines in 1935 exceeded the value of the combined exports of the following countries—China, Japan, Germany, Italy, France and Sweden. We have heard a great deal of the value of our exports from this country and I commend to you that you turn your eyes to the industry of mining which really undoubtedly has reached proportions where it is one of our chief primary industries.

For the last month, we have had the unique experience as members of this Club of being taken through the air with the greatest of ease, with Colonel Billie Bishop at three hundred miles an hour, and of following some fifteen miles into the stratosphere with Captain Stevens. of being taken by Dr. Dafoe to the north country last week and introduced to five of the most prosperous gold diggers, possibly, that Canada has ever known, and this week we are going to be taken down in mother earth and see gold in the raw, by none other than Dr. Charles Camsell, who is Deputy Minister of Mines in the Federal Government.

You will be interested to know that this gentleman has attained greatness. You know some people consider that they do not attain greatness until they have a cigar or a street or a cocktail named after them. Dr. Camsell already has named after him a river, a vast bay and at least one mountain. He has Fellowship in some seven of the leading mining, geological and engineering institutes on this continent. He has been President of three of them. He has for his services been decorated by His Majesty, the King. He has received degrees from three universities on the continent and there has been no major engineering project instituted in Canada for the last thirty-five years that has not had in some way Dr. Camsell called into consultation on it, whether it be railways, engineering or power.

With all these honours showered upon him, I submit, however, he is such a true Canadian that he is far more proud of the fact he was born in Fort Liard in the Northwest Territory, and that his father was Captain Julian Camsell, the Chief Factor in the Hudson's Bay Company.

I have much pleasure in introducing Dr. Camsell. (Applause.)

Dr. Charles Camsell: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Sir, and Gentlemen: Regardless of the fact that the Minister of Mines for Ontario, and his Deputy Minister are on either side of me, it is not my intention to address you on mining, but rather on geography.

May I first express my pleasure in accepting this invitation to speak before your Club. Geography, as some of you may be aware, is a subject in which I am intensely interested. As I stated to my Minister this morning, I should like to have it said of me after my life's journey is ended, that I had made a real contribution toward bringing the various parts of the country into closer relationship. Incidentally that is a primary objective of the Canadian Geographical Society, with which I have been actively associated since its foundation. Should you be in agreement with that objective may I request that you support the Society.

I wish today to give you an account of a 4,000-mile aerial trip I made last summer through northwestern Canada, and to show by a series of slides something of the character of the country along the course of the flight. The expedition had a three-fold purpose (1) the inspection of several geological parties (2) the investigation of a number of matters on behalf of the Administrative Council of the Northwest Territories, of which I have been a member for some fifteen years, and (3) observing and photographing from the air a large area of unknown country in northern British Columbia and southeastern Yukon. This latter was to provide us with information for use in completing a large scale relief map of Canada being constructed by the Canadian Geological Survey, and to enable us to determine the nature of the country north of latitude 60 degrees, where Liard river cuts across the northern extremity of the Rocky Mountains.

The trip commenced at Prince Rupert and ended at Edmonton. It took us through the northern part of British Columbia, southeastern Yukon, and the Mackenzie river district. Plans were made in cooperation with the Civil Aviation Branch, Department of National Defence, and the flight was carried out by Canadian Airways. The personnel of the party consisted of the pilot, Mr. C. H. Dickens and a mechanic, W. Sunderland, Mr. A. D. McLean, Superintendent of the Civil Aviation Branch, and myself. We used a Fairchilds 71 plane, with a lifting capacity of 6,000 pounds inclusive of its own weight, and with a range of about 500 miles. Its equipment included an aerial camera and a radio.

The map (slide) shows the course of our trip. Commencing at Prince Rupert, we followed the coast to Wrangell, Alaska. From there we turned inland along Stikine river, landing eventually at Dease Lake, one of the headwaters of the Liard River. From Wrangell to Dease Lake was by far the most spectacular portion of the whole trip, taking us up the deep valley of the Stikine, past great glaciers which flow slowly down to the water's edge, over snow-capped mountains into the interior, and across the divide which at Dease Lake is only 2,500 feet above sea level. We then followed the Dease river to its junction with the Liard, from where we commenced our photographic survey, which continued down the river to the eastern side of the mountains, a total distance of 300 miles. From here we took photographs at minute and a quarter intervals of the immediate valley of the river, and of the Grand Canyon in particular.

We then returned west, and from an elevation of 10,000 feet, photographed the unmapped country north of Liard river. Occasional pictures were taken to the south to show the change of topography between the Rocky Mountains and the plateau country to the north of the river.

Landing at the notorious, so-called "Tropical Valley," we made numerous observations and then continued our flight westward almost to the mouth of Dease River. From there we proceeded directly north for about 75 miles, and then right-angled eastwards across the unmapped country. This was the most critical portion of the trip as there were no suitable landing places.

We stopped at Fort Liard, just within the Northwest Territories, and on the second day set out to return to the unknown Liard River country. We soon encountered adverse weather conditions which drove us back zigzag fashion north and east, until we came out on the Liard River. We followed the river to Fort Simpson and from there we proceeded northward along the Mackenzie river to its junction with the Great Bear river. After a four day delay due to bad weather at Fort Norman we continued eastward across Great Bear Lake to the Eldorado property at Cameron Bay. Two days later we made the flight across the barren lands to the mouth of the Coppermine river at the Arctic Ocean. It was the most northerly part of our trip.

Turning southward we proceeded to Edmonton, by way of Great Bear and Great Slave Lakes, stopping en route at Fort Smith, the Lake Athabasca gold area in Saskatchewan, and at Fort McMurray. The whole trip from Prince Rupert to Edmonton was made in seventeen days or actually ten days of flying time. The flight was of particular interest to me as in my younger days I had covered most of the ground by canoe or on snowshoes taking three years however to complete the trip.

Recently I was asked as to the conditions that obtained in respect to cost of supplies, living accommodations and related matters. We obtained a supply of gasoline at Wrangell for which we paid eighteen cents a gallon, and replaced it at two points, namely Dease Lake and Fort Liard. At Dease Lake we paid $1.70 a gallon. We were equipped with a camp outfit, which was not used, as we stayed overnight at trading posts, missions, and R.C.M.P. quarters. We were received most hospitably, but visitors are a rare occurrence, and it was often long past midnight before we retired. I was afforded little opportunity to write up my observations at night, consequently this task was attended to early in the morning before the others were awake. One can do with much less sleep in the north during the summer season than is required in this part of the country, and I understand that it is the practice in the north to accumulate a reserve supply of sleep in the winter months for use during the summer months.

Our principal geographical observation was to find that the Rocky Mountains, which run as a continuous range through a thousand miles of Canadian and U.S. territory, level off to the north as plateau country near latitude 60 degrees, and that to the northeast the Mackenzie mountains rise gradually, continuing as a solid mountain range to the northeastern edge of Alaska. Between the two ranges is a sixty-mile gap, where the country rises gradually, and where entry is afforded into the Cordillera region.

Incidentally Mr. McLean joined our party principally because of the interest of his Branch in planning an air route from Toronto to Japan. Following the line of a great circle the route would be directly through the area of the sixty-mile gap. Knowledge of the occurrence of this gap then is of real practical interest to aviators, as through it they would have a direct means of access to the Pacific Ocean and to Japan, unobstructed by high mountain ranges.

The Mackenzie Mountains are perhaps the largest single group in Canada. They are a solid range, with a maximum width of nearly 300 miles and a length of 600 miles. So far these mountains have been traversed on only two occasions. Mr. Keele, then with the Geographical Survey, crossed over the middle of the range in 1906, and I made the traverse farther north. Apart from the knowledge gained on these two traverses, the whole range is practically unknown, and it offers perhaps the best field in Canada for geographical exploration.

Our observations in respect to the so-called "Tropical Valley" are of perhaps the greatest popular interest. Having camped in the valley in February 1896 I have never been able to appreciate why it has been described as "Tropical," especially as during the two weeks I spent there the temperature ranged from 20 degrees to 40 degrees below zero. I recorded these extremely low temperatures with the Government, but it did little to dampen the enthusiasm of writers, who insisted that tropical conditions obtained in a far northern latitude.

On our first flight in a westerly direction from Fort Liard we landed in the valley and after scouting around the shore we found a trail leading inland. Following it we reached a broken down cabin, the roof of which had been crushed by a tree, and on the door of which was a note reading "Moved to the Hot Springs." Continuing on the trail northward, we arrived at an open meadow with luxurient vegetation. Picking up the trail on the far side of the meadow we arrived shortly at two other cabins. Here we found evidences of the occupation of the valley area by Tom Smith and his daughter some years ago. The "Tropical Valley" has been associated with their names since they entered the locality from the Yukon side in 1924.

After remaining in the valley for some two years they decided to dispose of their catch of furs at Fort Liard. To the east of the valley is the most tortuous portion of the Liard river, a canyon forty miles in length, which during the season of high water, is not regarded as being navigable. Smith and his daughter got safely through the dangerous waters of the upper gorge, Devil's Gorge, and the canyon, and had passed the rapids when their canoe was capsized. The father was drowned, and the daughter, then only about sixteen years of age, was stranded on a bar with the empty canoe in the middle of the river. Using her hands as paddles she reached the main shore, and from there, using a stick as a paddle she proceeded down the river. Later she was taken by the Indians to the Hudson's Bay Post at Fort Liard. On the door of their cabin we found written what was undoubtedly Tom Smith's last message to the world. It read simply "We are leaving for Fort Liard." In and about the cabin we found pots and pans, a whip-saw and a broken sled, the things associated with most prospector's cabins.

In the course of our visit to the Tropical Valley we located the "hot springs" that have attracted so much attention. They are not at all hot, some having a temperature of 46 degrees F., against 60 degrees F for that of the water in the main river. At other points the water is warm enough to prevent the little ponds surrounding the streams from being frozen even in winter, a fact I observed during my visit to the district in February 1898.

The flight between Wrangell and Fort Simpson on the Mackenzie river was as I have stated the most spectacular portion of the trip. For, though planes not infrequently enter the upper Liard country from the west, and the lower Liard from the east, I could find no record of a single direct flight over the whole width of the Cordillera area in this region. The physiographic conditions across that section are very different from those across any other section of the Rockies south to the International boundary. On crossing the lofty mountains of the Coast Range one sees below him the Dease lake plateau, which has an elevation of about 4,000 feet. Continuing along the course of the Dease river, we reach the Cassiar mountain range, some fifty miles wide, beyond which is another plateau of lower elevation than the Dease lake plateau. Finally we arrive at the gap near Fort Liard.

The Liard river is 700 miles long, and is comparable in size to the Ottawa river. It cuts through the northern end of the Rocky Mountains at the point where they begin to flatten off to a plateau, forming the Grand Canyon, a forty-mile length of water which is exceedingly difficult to navigate.

The Liard river country was first explored about 100 years ago by Robert Campbell who entered it from the east. Trading posts were established at different points by the Hudson's Bay Company, but the Company was forced to abandon the region in 1865 owing to the difficulties encountered in persuading Indians to navigate the dangerous waters of the river. Other travellers entered the region in later years, among them being Mr. R. G. McConnell, who in 1887, as an officer of the Canadian Geological Survey, made the trip up the Stikine river and down the Dease, and thence down the Liard to the Mackenzie river. I consider it one of the most remarkable expeditions ever made by an officer of the Survey, and I feel that sufficient credit has never been given him. He travelled with one man in a crude boat during the extremely dangerous high water season.

My own travels in the area date back to 1897, at a time when I was youthful and filled with the hope of making a fortune in the Klondike. Four of us, including my brother travelled some 300 miles by boat until the freeze-up and then made the remainder of the journey on snowshoes, pulling our toboggans until we reached the head waters of the Frances river, where we remained for two months on the verge of starvation. Between the mouth of Dease River and Telegraph Creek, a stretch of 250 miles, I have tramped in summer with a pack on my back. I covered the distance between Telegraph Creek and Wrangell several times during the winter of '98-99, when I had the honour of carrying Her Majesty's mail, making the round trip once a month. Having long before travelled this country on foot and by canoe it was indeed interesting during my recent flight to watch the river below, picking out spots here and there where in bygone years something interesting, amusing, or perhaps tragic had happened. It was an experience, which because of memories of the past, I was able to enjoy perhaps more so than did my companions.

Since my visit thirty-five years ago there have been few travellers down the Liard river. The Grand Canyon has proven an effective barrier both to white and to Indians and those on either side of the Cassiar range know little or nothing of each other.

We will now have the series of slides, which will illustrate something of the nature of the country along the course of the trip.

(Slide.) This is a photo of our party.

(Slide.) This view shows the four members of our 1897 expedition—my brother, Wright, Pelly and myself. This is our dog team.

(Slide.) This is Tom Smith's cabin.

Our next stop was to be at Fort Liard, a distance of some 600 miles from Dease lake. This meant that we had to carry a full load of gasoline, and we experienced some difficulty in taking off, particularly as Dease lake is about 2,500 feet above sea level.

Following along Dease river we reached McDame creek where we spent the first night in our trip from Wrangell. The McDame creek area is practically abandoned today except for a few prospectors, a Hudson's Bay trader, and B. C. police officer, whereas in the late seventies and early eighties it was a prosperous mining camp.

(Slide.) This is a typical view of the plateau country immediately to the east of the Cassiar river. It has an elevation of about 3,000 feet, and is well forested with good timber. Flying over the country, no mountains are seen for miles ahead.

(Slide.) This is the junction of the Dease and the

Liard rivers, from where we descended to Fort Liard, a practically isolated Hudson's Bay trading post, with little signs of habitation beyond a few cabins. News from the outside world is received by radio but there are no means for sending out messages.

I recall an incident of my early travels near Fort Liard. As we were passing an Indian encampment in a canoe a woman came screaming to the river, and on enquiry we found that she had been accused by her people of bringing bad luck to them, and that they wished to be rid of her. We learned later that they drowned her the following winter.

(A series of slides showing the route followed.)

(Slide.) This is a view of the Eldorado camp, at LaBine Point, Great Bear Lake. It is Canada's most northerly mining enterprise.

At Cameron Bay, the administrative centre, there is a good air harbour and the bay has an excellent sandy beach, one of a few along the east shore of Great Bear Lake.

That completes the slides. (Hearty applause.)

Chairman Armstrong: Gentleman, I am quite confident that you will agree with me that you know of nobody better qualified to be Governor of the Northwest Territory than Dr. Camsell. (Applause.) I am confident also that I can assure him that his name will go down in Canadian history as one who has played a major part in the development of our country in bringing together the remote districts with which he is so familiar.

On behalf of The Empire Club, Sir, it gives me much pleasure to extend to you our sincere appreciation of a most interesting and brilliant address and we thank you. (Applause.)

CANADA'S PROBLEMS IN RELIEF AND ASSISTANCE

AN ADDRESS BY MISS CHARLOTTE WHITTON, C.B.E., M.A., OTTAWA

Thursday March 19th, 1936

MR. J. H. BRACE, President of the Club, introduced the Guest speaker as follows:

May I first welcome the ladies to this gathering. We are very pleased indeed to have them with us and to join us in doing honour to our Guest Speaker.

I would like to draw the attention of the members of the Club to next week's meeting. It will be held on Wednesday instead of Thursday. The Guest Speaker will be General Sir Edmund Ironside.

Today we have with us Miss Charlotte Whitton, C.B.E. a citizen of Ottawa — I think I could say a citizen of Canada, of Geneva, in fact, a world renowned citizen. Last evening when speaking to a friend who I think knows Miss Whitton, very well, he passed the remark that we would have as our guest speaker today the Canadian with the most brilliant brain we could find. He made no inference as to that being one only amongst the ladies; he threw in the professional and business people, the artists, the scientists, and scholars and even the politicians.

Miss Whitton's work associated with Welfare and her work associated with the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire is so well known that I do not have to make even passing reference to it. So I am going, with a great deal of pleasure, to call upon Miss Whitton, who will speak to us on the subject: "Canada's Problems in Relief and Assistance."

Miss Charlotte Whitton, C.B.E., M.A.: Mr. Chairman, Guests and Members of the Empire Club of Toronto. If I were uncomfortable before the Chairman's introduction, you can imagine that he has added little to my comfort. I noticed, however, as I signed in the Guest Book that barely two or three weeks ago, Dr. Dafoe was the Guest Speaker of the Club, and then I understood why a spinster had been asked to this meeting today.

(Amusement.)

Canada's problems in welfare and assistance are restricted neither to urban nor rural areas, to east nor west, to north nor south; they concern directly or indirectly all her eleven million people scattered across this half-continent that is our Canada, and they vary with the individual life and character of the millions of homes and solitary men and women, youths and young women, whose different ships float fitfully upon the stream of human destiny.

There was, for instance, in my mind that home in a remote lumbering area of the Maritimes—a small, trim little log cabin, with homey little flower borders in the small garden, and vegetables nodding hopefully in the stretches cleared to the woods. Three bright, little youngsters, brown as rabbits and as quick, darting about in the clearing. A vigorous, young settler, and his cheery, enterprising little wife: here they were making a home on the edge of the settlement, clearing and planting in the spring and summer, while he worked in the camps in the winter and in the nearby mills during the "sawing." Two years later, passing the same way, sullen, ragged, frightened children slunk away from the car, into a background of tangled garden, down-at-heel house and a whole atmosphere of inexpressible despair, as a slouching, unkempt man came round the corner, where a leaking water trough drained into a greenish tub of rainwater. The story was simple, a fourth baby had come, "sudden," as the father put it, one night in the depth of winter "with him in the woods" "and her alone with the children." "Something went wrong"—in spite of all that hastily summoned neighbours could do the next day, and before the doctor could come, "twelve miles away"—and life, hope, security went out of that home with the life of the mother and her unborn child.

Vary that story as to detail and place, as to crowded city slum or pleasant country town, or stark stretches of the northland, or prairie, as to the mother with her first child and the mother with her sixth, as to poor homes, and homes not so poor, and multiply it eleven hundred and fifty times; multiply those three motherless chidren to five thousand, and you have some concept of Canada's challenge in the problem of maternal care, each year. Picture as related to it, fifteen thousand babies under one year of age—seventy-two out of every thousand born alive, whom we lose annually, nearly half in the first month of life, and you have some picture of our problem of infant mortality.

Then look at the record of the prenatal clinic of your own Toronto General Hospital, with one of the lowest death rates achieved in outpatient work anywhere; examine the creditable achievements of the Victorian Order of Nurses in Canada, in reducing maternal deaths in the homes they serve; check the incredibly fine records of the Outpost Hospitals of the Red Cross in maternal service, or examine results such as your own Department of Health has obtained in reducing infant deaths and you have the other aspect of the challenge—knowledge of the ways to save life, and protect health if only we have the skill to plan, and the means to serve.

Think back of all, to your Departments of Health, the hospitals of the country in which $38,000,000 a year is spent, and in which one-third of those cared for are public pay patients. Realize that our maternal and infant death rates, serious as they are, record real progress even in these last years of strain, that eight thousand fewer babies died in 1934 than in 1926—and you have in all these problems, our achievements in meeting them, our services to deal with them, a glimpse for a moment at some of Canada's problems and needs in the field of maternal and child hygiene.

Within the last week I was in a Social agency, where a sunburned young woman of twenty-six had just told her story to the worker in charge. Homeless and dependent in a Western mountain village, she had decided to "beat her way" east, working as she could find work, to get to one of the eastern centres of presumably greater employment. For eight years she had "hiked" across Canada, here getting casual employment, there using up her meagre earnings: life being lived all the time nearer the edge of precarious living and moral standards, finally last week, without work or savings or home, a suppliant at the desk of the agency caring for unmarried mothers and their children.

Again vary the details, the place, the contributing circumstances, and magnify your picture into more than eight thousand unmarried mothers and their babies born each year in Canada. Picture in your mind the mere problems of care and adjustment for those women and nameless mites, the long pathetic vista down which many of them will travel all their lives: Conjure up in your mind the advanced legislation of six of our Provinces to deal with the problem, the administration involved. Try to realize something of the service of your own Infant's Home, handling a great problem magnificently, with one thousand children under four years of age in care annually! Your Provincial services collecting over $100,000 per year for payment of maintenance on behalf of these children throughout Ontario.

Just for a moment you have glimpsed some of our problems in the care and protection of the child born out of wedlock.

Down on the Atlantic Seaboard, some few years ago, about eight I think, I was up coast when one of the terrific equinoctial gales swept the whole eastern coast. In one small fishing settlement, not one of thirty families but had lost one adult man, father, husband, son or brother in the fishers' boats that had gone down off the Grand Banks. The story was one of quiet, unrelieved, blank tragedy, with need and dependency facing many of the sturdy little homes. Later, a few months, in a Province further west, I passed through a mining area where twenty homes had lost the breadwinner through one of those stark and sudden disasters that too often wait upon those who go into the depths of the earth that Canada may have wealth. Running through the vital statistics for another purpose, the other day, one could not but be struck with the number of deaths of men in vigorous, middle life, in Canada each winter from respiratory diseases.

Behind the wage-earning heads of families in all these groups, there is the picture of the average small family home in Canada—sixty per cent. of those homes in the working population dependent upon wages, wages in many cases of low income, that keep the family just maintained, perhaps with a very small margin for insurance, sufficient to tide over a few months, at most a year or two of need. And then, the grim struggle of the mother, the effort to find work for young, half-trained children, strain, uncertainty, insecurity and need. Too often in other days it meant the break-up of the family, the Children's Home or Orphanage. Today it still means that in many cases and in some Provinces.

These are the pictures in the Canadian scene back of the development of Mothers' Allowances, back of the evolution of the constructive Workmen's Compensation laws. Today over fourteen thousand homes and forty thousand children are being maintained under such plans in this Dominion, and all the problems of inquiry, supervision, care, maintenance, guidance, advice and adjustment involved therein are what we mean when we refer to problems of dependency arising from the premature death or ill health of the wage earner.

In a bare, clean room in a flat in a western city, an emaciated, fine-featured woman lay dying. Clustered about, frightened, bewildered, there were gathered five children from four or five years of age, upwards, all born in Canada of the Ukrainian father who had been drowned four summers back, and without naturalization, citizenship or residence qualifications entitling his widow and family to benefit under the allowances system. Helped by the family agency, the mother, also a Ukrainian, of the marked nobility of countenance of many of the Slavic and Central European women, had charred by day, embroidered the colourful smocking or kerchiefs of her people by night, kept her little family intact and independent. And, now, attacked by an insidious disease, her weakened, weary body was slipping into rest, and these five little children were alone, five thousand miles from any near relative; and they alone were in her mind.

And in the room, there was the Victorian Order Nurse, who for some months now had called daily, the friend from the Family agency who had stood beside this woman through these years, and with her the worker from the Children's Aid Society, to which these children, so soon to be left without any guardian, would be committed to care, and for which the Society would assume all the responsibilities of care, training and guardianship until twenty-one years of age, or until they could be re-established, probably when the older children were in a position to earn and found a home again.

These circumstances of a child's need of care and protection, often within their own homes, sometimes without, sometimes with both parents dead, or one dead, and the other deserted, sometimes with one or both quite incapable of responsible parental care, are some of the lights that play in the background of what we describe as our problems of child care and protection, in which eighty-six Children's Aid Societies with more than twenty thousand children in their keeping, one hundred and thirteen homes and orphanages with another fifteen thousand in care, serve against the background of child protection legislation in eight Provinces and the Quebec Public Charities in the ninth.

Only yesterday, I listened to a discussion that may give you a picture of the complex nature of some of these problems. A little girl was born some years ago to an unmarried mother: the agency in that field maintained the child until she was six years of age, when she was taken into the home of an aunt and uncle, in a Province which lacks provision for the transfer of guardianship through child protection legislation. Her own mother meanwhile "married well," later told her husband of the child, and he insisted upon the little girl coming into their home. A year later he died, leaving a fair sized estate: the child had not been adopted, could not inherit from him, and this being also a Province without equal guardianship laws, the child was not the mother's heir. With her husband's steadying influence gone, the mother slipped back into other ways of life, was injured in a motor accident, lost her reason and is in an institution for mental care. The aunt and uncle took the little girl, who loved them, back into their childless home, and in motoring through another Province, left the child for a few days in another aunt's home, because there were children there. On their return, this aunt refused to let the child leave, presumably in the hope that some day her mother's estate will come to her. The child is miserably unhappy, so are the aunt and uncle who are in a much better position to give her adequate upbringing, but the child has no guardian: the law of the Province of her residence provides no machinery for the constitution of such guardianship under the circumstances, and there's the situation.

That is typical of the problems we have in mind when we maintain that child placing, guardianship surrender and adoption are all highly technical processes calling for skill, training and experience on the part of those who are engaged in the social services.

Delinquency

A man who worked as a "powder monkey" blowing stumps in land clearing in a small village in Eastern Ontario many years ago, was killed by an accidental discharge of dynamite. He left a widow and six children, the oldest eight and all boys but one. The mother "took in" sewing, mending and knitting, baked bread which the boys delivered, cooked and "served out," at "parties" in the district. It was before "Mother's Allowances." In meagre care, with thrift, penury and struggle she got along, her dark hair greying, her well filled figure shrinking to spareness. Two of the boys enlisted, one was killed: he had married after enlistment: the other married overseas. Her family grew up and scattered, all but the youngest lad to whom she was passionately devoted. Last of her flock, she undoubtedly "spoiled" him: he got out of control, ran amuck, at fifteen was involved in the theft of a car, sent to the "Reformatory," as the town calls it. The mother visibly cringed under the blow, the shame and disgrace, as she told her story of years of poverty and need, of struggle and of hope, and as she said, "with never a bad debt owing and with never a policeman about my place or knowing my family."

These and other stories, changing in place and circumstance and nature lie behind our problems in the Delinquency and related services, lie behind the nine thousand young delinquents who pass through our Juvenile Courts in a year; behind the five hundred offenders under twenty years of age in our penitentiaries, behind the three thousand boys and seven hundred girls in our industrial schools and reformatories, motivate the legislation and services whereby we hope to see them re-established again.

Aged

And, to go further with that mother, old, broken in health and spirit, she is sitting in the twilight now, the two rooms that form her home and her modest wants dependent upon an Old Age pension. I see another woman in the same locality, working after her husband's imprisonment for a serious offence, as a cook in hotel and camps, keeping her children in a boarding home. They, too, have scattered, intent on their own lives and homes,—"her legs gone" and "her eyes bad" as she told me herself from long standing by hot stoves and over the steam. She is living in a home for the aged, where the one unmarried daughter who works for $12.00 a week, pays $5.00 a month towards her care, but as she says, "I've kept off the pension."

There are eight thousand aged in care in our institutions, another one hundred thousand in receipt of old age pensions, at a cost of more than twenty millions of dollars per year. Yes, Canada has a problem in providing for dependency arising from old age.

Rural Relief

All afternoon we drove through the dried out land: the Russian thistle grew so tall and dense, that the road led through a tunnel of it, reaching to the top of the car and necessitating driving with the headlights on: everywhere the grey-brown desolation of the desert; here and there fence posts showing through the drifted soil; in odd places thin horses, poor lean cattle standing bewildered by the outbuildings: nearly everywhere good looking farm homes, "all on relief," the investigator told me. We drove up to one, and with what pride that woman told us she was "getting by." She took us to her cellar, with gopher canned in rows of sealers—"it's as clean a little animal as a rabbit when you come to think of it," she said, and explained that her boys had kept themselves in shoes and clothes for school through the bounty paid on the gophers' skins. She showed us, too, wheat ground for porridge, roasted and ground for coffee, wool shorn, cleaned, combed, carded, spun and made up herself. She was "getting by" and cheery in the getting.

Trekking out from the Makwa Lake area in far Northern Saskatchewan, I met a man, woman and child, with a wagon filled with brush, some bedding, a mule trailing the vehicle drawn by a thin and weary team. I asked them if they were trekking out for good. They told me their home was South in the dry area: for three years, they had had no crop: this Spring they had put one in, then taken the grandfather seventy years old, trekked North, thirty-eight days on the way they told me, staked a piece of land, cleared space for a garden, put in vegetables, potatoes and a few oats, had seen it well under way, had left the old grandfather there to "tend it," were trekking South to see whether they had any harvest there, and were coming North again to winter. "One way or other, we ought to have our keep, don't you think?" They said.

Another home in the rugged country where we are seeking our tourist traffic. A man forty-eight, his wife forty-five, three boys fourteen to ninteen, a girl sixteen years of age, a married son, twenty-two, with his wife and baby, living in the same house, another baby coming, and a little "slavey" given food and lodging and clothing for doing the work. With three women over sixteen in the house, only the grandfather forty-eight at work "in the shanty." "These big boys and this young father don't want the risk of not getting on relief again, if they go, so they stay at home," and a system that we have allowed to get out of hand subsidizes their idleness.

Up the Pacific Coast, on one of the islands, a man and his wife, University graduates, four children, in a poor log cabin, lent to them by a friend, growing tulip bulbs—they are light to ship so you lose little in postage: teaching the children themselves: Hard and hopeless—yes, "but a great deal better" they said "than the hopelessness of relief in a city attic."

These are some of the lights and shadows behind the fifty thousand families on relief, or on the verge of it, in our rural areas, in our drought districts, in our frontier fringes and bad lands: these are some of the conditions in which more than one hundred thousand young persons between sixteen and twenty-five eating out their youth in idleness and need in the rural areas alone, apart from those idle in self-supporting homes.

City Relief

A young artisan, thirty-five years of age, married to a girl who had worked in the office at the plant: a neat little home, furnished on their savings:—Short time, then shut down: "Out," four years ago. Everything saleable gone now from the little home, the home gone, crowded together in two rooms, three frightened, uncertain little children, his skill slipping through disuse, hope and confidence and outlook blurred.

Vary the story to take in the white collar worker, the ice man let out with the coming of the frigidaire, the clerk displaced for the young graduate, vary it to include, if you will, the "chiseller" and the exploiter, but remembering that suffering, need, idleness and despair play their own part in turning the man who cannot work into the man who will not work. Vary it for town and large city, for East and West, for foreign and British and Canadian families, and perhaps you will see some of the one hundred and seventy-five thousand families on relief in urban centres.

You will see there with them and through them the agencies at work, like your Neighbourhood Workers and Family Service. That is something when we visualize, when we talk about our problems in Canada,—the Relief Family Welfare and Assistance.

Then there is the woman forty-nine years of age, a clerk in a department store over 30 years, let out in a merger for a younger woman. She had helped first younger brothers and sisters, then an aged mother, then a nephew and niece. Meagre savings go first: the dreary round seeking work for herself or the two youngsters, her shoes wearing thin: her neat clothes showing the seams, a trip after dark to a friend of earlier days, a loan, at last the Social Agency, "on relief," her homey little apartment gone, her nephew in camp, the girl in a hostel.

Some two thousand older, solitary, idle, dependent women are on relief lists today, and perhaps ten thousand displaced older men of comparable plight.

Youth

Crossing on a ferry in British Columbia, where a kindly policeman was giving me a lift, we heard suddenly a " 'Hullo, Sergeant" from the floor in the back of the car. "Don't you remember you had me in the jug back at Christmas for rod riding? Been waiting all day to take a chance on a car on this ferry." The lad later told me he was seventeen, had hiked from near St. John's Quebec, to the Coast, back as far as Sherbrooke, and was thus far West again. "Can't even make Victoria or Alaska though—the boat guys are too bright and tough." Oh! Yes! He could get work, a few weeks perhaps in the yards or mills, but if you were going to be broke anyway, might as well make a lark of it and see the country. A darn good war though, that's what he'd like to see, something for a fellow to do then—the war yarns were the best in the hostels or jungles, he thought.

Twenty thousand men in relief camps, one hundred and twenty-six thousand young wage earners unemployed, two hundred and ninety thousand who have never worked at all—break them down into lives like this, and others, and others, and others, you being to visualize the problem of idle youth, whether on relief or idle and dependent on their families.

Totals

Well, these are some of our problems in Welfare and Assistance, that leave us with one in six of our population at the best of times of these years and one in five in the winter, at the worst drawing in whole or in part on social aid and sending the annual cost up to one hundred and fifteen million dollars for relief under our special legislation alone, and altogether to something in the neighborhood of two hundred millions of dollars annually.

Low Income Worker

And will you look at that for a moment from the point of view of the average wage-earner in Canada today—he, I think, is in danger of becoming "the forgotten man." Our average male wage earner gets about $900.00 per year. And what does he pay out as an average consumer? 55 per cent on food, fuel, clothing and shelter, about 17 per cent on recreation, sickness, church, educational costs such as school books, etc., and 20 per cent now,—indirectly or directly, on taxes, and at most he has 8 per cent if he is lucky for savings and all emergencies. It just can't be done, and the sooner we realize two or three cardinal truths the better—that we must face the necessity of looking at our social problems, their increasing extent and their mounting cost as a whole: we must bring about co-ordination and co-relation in prevention and treatment among all our different units of government, and with partnership between our public and private services. You have in your city your Federation for Community Service attempting to bring about co-ordination in planning, in funds and in service. How many of you know it? How many of you have an intimate knowledge of it? How many of you are associated with it actively and intelligently? Now we can't build national agencies unless we have with our local agencies, within the cities and across the country, the understanding of our citizen bodies.

We must see our problems clearly, lift them clear, as we have on the whole lifted education clear,—and I say this with all humility—clear of political interest, manoeuvre and exploitation: we must realize that a State cannot treat its dependents better than its earning contributing taxpayers of low income: we must therefore introduce the contributory principle and sound actuarial practice, wherever measures of social assistance can be made susceptible thereto; and, most important of all, we must see our problems in their human elements, lives like yours and mine caught in the web of social or personal circumstance, susceptible of freedom and strength again, not on mass treatment, but as infinitely delicate, intricate human lives.

We must also realize that happiness, satisfaction and adjustment can be expressed in terms of other than material success alone, that life cannot be lived in terms only of a few finite years, corruption and decay, but is something to which we each contribute in the eternal current of our nation's and our Empire's life.

We must realize that human character being what it is, we cannot create and maintain complete equality of opportunity, but that we can and must assure to all our people a minimum of opportunity, with its standard as high as the resources of the community which assures it can provide; but that there is a limit to that capacity, and also that the very claim that the individual has upon the community for the community's care and assitance in need, must, if the State is to survive, carry an inescapable corollary of service and obligation from the individual to the community and the State.

Yes, Canada can solve her problems of social need and assistance, entirely to the extent that she will face them with intelligence, knowledge, courage and determination as the factors which condition the lives of millions of individuals and the ultimate destiny of the Dominion that is the greatest overseas unit in that venture of the partnership of free nations that we call the British Empire.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT BRACE: I think probably many of us during the course of the last twelve months have been rather satisfied that things were getting better, than many of our serious problems no longer were as serious. After hearing this address, hearing of the hundreds of thousands of people in distress, hearing of the many problems that face this Country, recognizing that we are a Country of only eleven million people, we come to realize just how serious all these problems are.

Thank God, we have men and women who not only have the courage to follow up and check such problems, but who also have the courage to try and do something to correct them! In that I think we have our hope for the future. In that I think we all as good citizens should and must do our part if in the future Canada is going to be the Country that we want it to be. ,

On your behalf I extend to Miss Whitton our most sincere thanks for this enlightening, studied and very serious address, which she has presented to us,

INDIA AND THE EMPIRE

AN ADDRESS BY GENERAL SIR WILLIAM EDMUND IRONSIDE, K.C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.

Wednesday, March 25th, 1936

PRESIDENT BRACE: Your Honour, Distinguished Guests and Gentlemen: On behalf of the members of The Empire Club of Canada, I am pleased indeed to have with us, His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, distinguished officers of Canada's military forces and the members of the Canadian Club. We are very pleased to have you with us to join in doing honour to our distinguished guest today.

Brigadier General Elkins, C.B.E., D.S.O., Commanding Officer of District Number 2, is sitting at our head table and I am going to ask Brigadier Elkins to introduce our honoured and distinguished guest.

BRIGADIER GENERAL ELKINS: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour, Gentlemen: First of all, I would like to thank The Empire Club for their hospitality today to myself and to many other officers of this District. We appreciate very much the opportunity of meeting General Ironside. It is seldom we have the opportunity of hearing an officer of such varied experience as the speaker today and I am very sensible of the privilege I have in introducing him.

General Ironside has a very long and distinguished service and he is particularly able to speak on the subject which he has chosen for today. General Ironside was commissioned in the Royal Artillery in 1899, served with distinction in the South African War and after that war, between that and the outbreak of the Great War, he served both at home and in India in many regimental staff appointments.

On the outbreak of the War he held the rank of Major. In 1916, when the 4th Canadian Division was formed, he was appointed to it as General Staff Officer and in that capacity he became known to a large section of Canadians, many of whom are here today.

After that he joined the 99th Infantry Brigade and in 1918 he was appointed to command the Allied Forces at Archangel and again came in contact with the Canadians.

In 1920, he commanded the Ismid forces, and in 1921, the British forces in Northwest Persia. From 1922 to 1930, he was Commandant of the Staff College at Camberley and for two years, was in charge of the 2nd Division at Aldershot.

In 1928, he went to India for three years, until 1931 and commanded the Meerut District. From 1931 until 1933, he was Lieutenant of His Majesty's Tower of London, and in 1932, he was made Colonel-Commandant of the Royal Artillery.

In 1933, he again went to India, this time as Quartermaster-General. He has just relinquished that post and is now on his way to England to take up the position of General Officer Commanding-in-Chief the Eastern Command.

I have much pleasure in presenting to you, General Ironside. (Hearty Applause.)

GENERAL SIR WILLIAM EDMUND IRONSIDE: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour, Gentlemen: I thank you very much, indeed, for the honour you have done me in coming here and I won't thank you any more, but I will start straight away on my subject.

Now, Gentlemen, I want to draw a picture for you of India as if I were talking to people who know nothing about it.

Here, we have an enormous country which is filled with 350,000,000 people, at least, if not more. It is very rich and one of the few countries in the world which has got a surplus in its budget. That means a great deal in these days. It means that the country has got great richness in it, because if the years become good the budget will get better and better. It doesn't mean to say we have been skinning the people. Some people in some countries say the British have been skinning them because the government of India spends its money in India and if you only saw the works that are being carried out, if you saw the railways, if you saw the irrigation—there is no irrigation in the world like there is in India. The five great rivers in the Punjab in hot weather are drained completely dry, are taken away in canals, these five enormous rivers, and they go right through the whole of the Punjab. Such a thing is unknown in any other country. The roads in India are now as good as anywhere. The motor traffic is increasing beyond all belief, and the country itself is rapidly approaching—what shall we say?—Civilization.

Now, I would like just to draw a comparison to you with South Africa. South Africa was held an alien nation to the Anglo-Saxon race and we fought them from 1870 until 1902, and the bitterness that was born against us was great. All that period it was really terrible to see the bitterness between the two races and then we settled down to what we soldiers thought would be a long occupation of the country with an enormous force. The police force that we started with was very large and we left some four divisions in the country, thinking we should stay there for years and years and years.

In 1908, six years later, Lord Milner came out and after a certain amount of talk and to our horror, the country was handed over and given autonomy. I remember exactly what the people said. We all said the same: "Here you are—what have you done it all for? You have conquered this country, now you will have to reconquer it. Nothing will ever go right. Everything will fall down." We were really pessimists, we were all pessimists.

Well, now, in 1914, that was six years later, not only did the Union of South Africa put down a rebellion in their own country, a rebellion of their own people—that is, DeWitt and some of his friends had made a rebellion and it was put down by Generals Botha and Smuts. They did that and it would have taken us a great deal more time to do it than it took them, but they sent a large force to German Southwest, and also to German East, and also a large contingent to France.

Now, I ask you, was not that a justification of what we had done in 1908? And I, myself, lived through it right up from 1899 until practically 1912 or '13, with one short interval in India, and I am quite sure what we are doing in India now is going to have the same result and we shall get the same willingness out of India, voluntarily, which we should not get if we did not give them autonomy and I think the result will be the same.

(Applause.)

I don't say for one minute that the problem is the same. The old 'hard-beat' Indian army officer will probably tell me I am wrong, but I have been back to India so many times with intervals in between that I have seen the difference perhaps he did not see and the rate at which India is improving in every point of view is so extraordinary that I put my views against his. And men like Winston Churchill—I am glad to note that when he saw the thing had been passed and was finished and autonomy was to be given, he bowed, said, "Yes, I have made my fight. It is now done," and that, I hope, will be what each one of us will do in India, each one of the servants out there, because the hardest thing of all is going to be the people actually in the service out there, voting their own jobs away because it means fewer jobs for Britishers and more for Indians and when you are in the machine, it is very hard to feel yourself being ground between the cogs. That will be our hardest thing.

The difficulties in India are actually more than they would be in a country like Canada, or a country even like South Africa. The real reason is there is not one nation in India, there are several nations. There are over a hundred languages, some of them bearing no comparison to the others whatever. We had to make a language that would suit the whole country. Urdu is the language of the camp and people talk that as a vernacular and whatever language you were born to, you talk that one with your parents, and it is most extraordinary to think we should have produced something which is not our own language. We didn't produce English. It showed our own diffidence. I think it would have been better if we had brought English in and made them use it. We brought in a language that was a mixture of Arabic, Persian, and a few other things, closer to their own vernacular.

There is not only these differences of languages, coming from the different invasions which took place in India, but there are the religions. The two main religions are, of course, Mahommedanism and Hinduism, and those two are, perhaps I might say, in the sort of state of 1600 in England. You go back to that date and think how the Catholics and Protestants were fighting and I don't think in India the Hindus and Mahommedans are as bad now as we were in 1600, and they are getting better every day, but the spirits do light up on the slightest pretext—they light up and then you may have a row. And for that reason, you will find that the British troops will not leave India. They are necessary and any of you who have seen the British Tommy in a row, keeping the peace, will see what an inestimable thing it is to have some one like that. You will see him picking up a woman off the streets, who has thrown herself deliberately in front of a machine, a tank or a motor to be killed in order just to show that she wishes to be killed, the Tommy, picking her up and saying, "Here, old woman, you are better on the platform here," and he pulls her off. She doesn't understand what he says and he doesn't understand what she says. And he stands there, with the most awful epithets being poured on his head, perhaps he smiles and lights a fag—he goes on just the same.

There is very little shooting in India. There are other countries where they have to shoot and it is the most extraordinary thing, if you read the papers—we are the brutal—what shall I call it?—the brutal rulers of a downtrodden country.

A man told me the other day that the Maharajah of Patiala was paying Mussolini a visit and Mussolini, among other things said to him, "Aren't you ready to throw off this awful oppression of England?" and the Maharajah of Patiala leaned forward, looked at Mussolini a moment, couldn't believe what he said, and then burst into a roar of laughter. Mussolini said, "What are you laughing at?" He said, "You" What better answer could he have given? Such a thing to a man like the Maharajah of Patiala—he couldn't understand it.

Where is the oppression? Here we are, going faster than most people think is possible to give them autonomy. What more can you do Then Patiala said, "To me it is extraordinary to think a man running a country like Italy—he must have had some people in India at some time—could think we were oppressing them. His idea is shooting people right and left in the streets." I am perfectly certain there is less shooting in India than there is in America.

Well, now, our difficulties are largely composed of that religious difficulty and of the caste difficulty. As you know, caste is very rigid in India. A man is born to a certain rank of life and there he stays for his life. If your father is a leather worker, and to work in leather is a low thing in Indian religion because they look on a cow as sacred and therefore it is rather low, you have got to stay there.

Then you get what you call these untouchables. An untouchable may have been educated at Oxford and may be an M.A. of Oxford and a Doctor of Laws, but if he goes back to India he is still untouchable. Such a thing can't go on and you see lots of stories about untouchables. They are people who do the lower grade work in India. of course, but there is no chance for them to rise under the system of rigid caste and they are throwing it over. And there is now, and you see it in the papers, a movement among them to say, "If this religion to which we belong will not give us a chance in the world, we will join any other religion which will give us a chance." It is a rather curious state of affairs that it should have arisen at all, that they should prepare to give up a thing like that. If the shadow of an untouchable falls across the food of a high caste Brahmin or a high caste Hindu, he throws it away. It used to be the case with the high caste Sepoys. If a Sepoy was having a meal and his own British officer passed and a shadow fell across his food, he would throw it away. All that is gone. We couldn't call it nonsense, because it is in their religion; but it is all gone and the young officers that we are now preparing for the Indian army are highly educated boys, sent to a native school, exactly like Sandhurst. There you sit at the table with them and look to your right and to your left and see men of every caste sitting next to you, eating the same food as you, and the only thing is that neither pork nor beef are ever served because the Hindu won't eat it. He eats very little meat but he won't eat beef because a cow is sacred and the other gentleman doesn't like pig.

It is a most extraordinary thing to think you will now get Mohommedan servants bringing the white man his bacon in the morning with his breakfast. You even get Sepoys serving British officers and he will come in the morning and during the war he would give his officer his bacon.

That has changed things so much in India that one can hardly believe it.

The real fault, the trouble we have had in India is that we have educated such an enormous number of men, both at home and in India, at our universities in India, that we haven't been able to supply them with places. You all know perfectly well what that means. A young man comes out and he feels and thinks it is his right to have a place in the world and it is, of course, his right. You have got to give them something to do and to see them with a B.A. of Oxford or Cambridge or one of the Indian universities being offered a sum of money like twenty or thirty rupees a month is not a very great result for the money he has spent on his education. Now, those men must turn into discontented fellows. They must be caught by political factions and they must take the wrong turning.

One of the most educated provinces is Bengal. Now, Bengal can't absorb all the Bengalis who are educated. Now, what the Bengali would like would be that he should be handed over all the jobs all over India. But would that do—for your Saskatchewan and your Alberta and your Ontario—if one of your Provinces was much more highly educated than the others and said they had the right to take over all the clerical jobs in all of the other Provinces of Canada? There would be a nice row.

Well, that is what would happen in India so there will always be a certain amount of political difficulty. Under us they have always been able to get at the head people, but when they get their provincial autonomy which is the first step and that will be granted them as soon as the machinery can be made, as soon as they get that we hope that a great deal of the energy or steam that is being let off at us will then be let off against each other. That has been the experience in most places and when you think that our Provinces in India will have thirty millions or so in each, it is not quite the same as you who have three hundred thousand or four hundred thousand in your Provinces. Our legislators in those Provinces will have plenty of people to legislate for. So I think this energy which is always there among an educated people will be put into the right lines and what we are trying to do is we are trying to get people not to want to run the diplomacy of India, whether they should fight China, or make brotherhood with Japan or anything like that. What we would like is that Mr. Loberia, or whatever his name is, who has been to Oxford, should go back to his town and see that the sanitation in that town is in good order, and that the local police are in good order, that the lighting of the town is done and that the pavements in the streets are put in order, and in fact all the municipal duties which are so often neglected.

That is what we want. If we can get the fellows to take that on in India, then surely they will rise up from that, and what we are doing, we are actually, deliberately, trying to drive the people into the provincial arena. As I say, there are some thirty million in each one.

Then, above, we have the Governor General, the Viceroy, and I want you to understand, although he is the same man, he has two duties. His first duty is he is the Governor-General of British India. That is only fifty per cent of India. The other fifty per cent is the Indian States and those Indian States are governed by independent rulers. They are in alliance with us and although we control to a certain degree, they are absolutely independent and very jealous of their independence. They are often accused of being behind hand and retrograde and I don't know what else, but mind you, you have a young democracy springing up in British India that thinks it knows everything and one knows what democracy means when it runs wild, and on the other side you have an absolutely old and well worn sovereignty. Some of these men date their ancestors back to the days when our ancestors were covered with woad. That is an absolute fact. These men are far better bred than we are in our own line. They go back and some of them really are very fine men indeed, and our wars out in India show us how fine they were and there is absolutely no reason whatever why they shouldn't produce leaders there. Our long eighty years domination has probably been lengthened by that awful thing, the Mutiny, which was a scourge. It may have been a good thing, it may have been a bad thing—I don't know—but we suffered from that and all sorts of things happened in India. We don't allow people to walk past the well where they threw the bodies of the women and children. We don't allow even now an Indian to pass by. Perhaps that will pass like everything else, but it has been in our feelings all the time there and those are the small things which do make trouble. An Indian has pride, a man bred like he is has pride and it is difficult to over-ride a pride like that.

I think those things are going. The courtesy you see between the upper castes of India and the Civil Service and the soldiers of India is such that you find all that has disappeared altogether among them.

Now, we are keeping the British Army in India, and one of the main reasons of doing that is that there is this question of the frontier. We have on the frontier a very difficult question. We have what is called the administrative frontier which is the frontier to which we have been able to go, and then the real frontier which is a good deal further on, a frontier to which we have not been able to go and inside that area there are some 250,000 armed men who really have not got enough to live on. They are wild tribes, men who look down upon India as the land of milk and honey and they look upon India as a place—"If I can only get in there I can get what I want." Who can blame them? Their ancestors had done it, year in and year out, before we arrived. Down came these people into the plains, and it has always been the same, but we have given India peace. We have given her peace, but these men are still there and we are now trying a new system. We are trying to civilize them and not to treat them like wild beasts. We are trying to say, "We will get there if we can." It costs a devil of a lot of money, still we are trying to get there.

What we are doing is this: Whenever there is any trouble, if they come and raid us and give us an excuse for punishing them, instead of bombing them from the air and killing people, what we are doing is this, we are building a road right up into the middle of their country and we are getting them to build it themselves. They come and draw money for it and the men don't destroy roads which they, themselves, have built and for which they have received money, and suddenly they find a motor car comes up that road with all sorts of funny things to sell, the sort of things the Indians like and he has money in his pocket for making the road and he can buy things from these people who come up. He likes to buy a little silk for his wife, all sorts of funny things like concertinas and things of that sort. He is a funny bird. The Commander-in-Chief always said, "If you can interest the women in something more civilized you can civilize the men. Take out silk undies to them." There is a great deal of truth in that.

The result has been we are gradually working up with our roads into the country. We give money to the country and we also make it possible to send up smaller forces. We can send them up by motor. And those people, if they have to go out figure it doesn't cost so much and gradually we will work up to the frontier because it is an unheard of thing to have a frontier that you won't let anybody else have but you can't reach yourself.

Gentlemen, I think I have come more or less to the end of the picture that I have tried to make for you of India. It is a country which has in it almost everything you want. It is self-supporting from almost every point of view. It is ready to support itself. It has got cheap labour and it has got in itself, from a military point of view, everything you may want. We were calculating the other day and we came to the conclusion there was very, very little we couldn't get. Now, with a country like that, surely we are doing the right thing when we give it this autonomy. We are keeping very, very little to ourselves and may I put it this way: If the crisis arises, and good Lord, surely the world is bad enough now, if the crisis arises again, shall we not reap as we reaped in 1914 from South Africa and as we have reaped from you in 1914 and from New Zealand. We made one mistake in the United States and we have never made another. (Applause.) If this Indian world stands up it means something greater, it means this, it means a bulwark against the aggressive East. We shall have put up something which will stand and our Empire is such that if England fell, the rest of the Empire would stand up, and before we fall, if ever such a thing should happen to us, if we could have made India stand up, we shall have done something greater than anything in this world, because no one else has ever tried or even attempted to do such a thing, to make India stand up, because she will be eaten up at once unless she is ready to defend herself. So, I will leave it at that. I think the thing has now practically been finished and I see a brilliant success for it. (Hearty applause.)

PRESIDENT: After such an address one cannot help but be proud of being British. (Applause.) I think we all feel that Britain is fortunate in being able to produce such men as General Ironside, Lord Willingdon and others who have done so much for the Empire in India. (Applause.)

I am going to ask Colonel Bishop, President of The Canadian Club to express our thanks to General Ironside.

COLONEL BISHOP: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour, General Ironside, Gentlemen: One rises with somewhat mingled feelings, primarily with a deep sense of appreciation for your very kindly thought in asking the Canadian Club to be present today to hear this magnificent address of General Ironside's. And secondly, to our distinguished guest of honour, himself, who typifies in his personality, his physical makeup, those characteristics which seem to be peculiar to the Englishman and his governing of the native states and of all matters pertaining abroad, namely, common sense in the first place; good will, in the second place, and last of all, a keen incisive sense of humour.

Those of the Canadian Corps remember General Ironside with a great affection and to those who were in the other services of the British Army, other than the Canadians, General Ironside was somewhat of a mythical figure. One heard the most astounding things about this famous 'Tiny' Ironside, when he was in the Intelligence Service. You agree with me, he is well named.

And we here today, express appreciation to him for his being with us and expounding the gospel of Imperial Governorship, or rather Trusteeship. It is something I never contemplated in my life but I know I am expressing on your behalf, the assembled members of The Empire Club and of The Canadian Club, a very grateful vote of thanks to him, and as a General going home to command the Eastern District, the Eastern Command, without being prophetic, one hazards the opinion it will not be long before we shall know him and look back on this day when Field Marshal, Sir William Edmund Ironside was with us. (Applause.)

CONDITIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA

AN ADDRESS BY MR. ALBERT G. PARTRIDGE

Thursday, April 2nd, 1936

PRESIDENT BRACE: When I recently read a review of the business life of our guest speaker I was impressed with the acceptance of responsibility which he took as he rose from the ranks to a senior position in the rubber industry. May I respectfully suggest that he has accepted a real challenge in taking over the office recently vacated by Mr. Carlyle. Mr. Carlyle and Mr. Partridge were both born in the United States and spent the early years of their lives there. Since coming to Canada Mr. Carlyle not only became one of us, but during his years with us he has given everything that he has had to give to his adopted country and that has been a great deal. (Applause.)

We are very glad to have Mr. Partridge come to us as a New Canadian. We believe he will follow in the footsteps of his predecessor and in so doing will enrich this great country of ours as well as himself. He has spent over 35 years in the rubber industry. During the past years he was the representative of the Goodyear Company in Great Britain, coming to Canada in March, 1935. He is a great believer in the programme covering educational assistance on the part of an organization for those employees who are ambitious to succeed. The results of such a programme, of course, are to the advantage of the organization as well as to the advantage of the individual. His policy as an industrialist is one of co-operation and the results from such a policy where the individual, the industry and the community are all recognized will be best for all concerned.

Mr. Partridge is going to speak to us today on the subject, "Conditions in Great Britain and America." I have very much pleasure, indeed, in introducing to you Mr. Albert G. Partridge, President of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited, a new Canadian to whom we give a very hearty welcome. (Applause.)

MR. ALBERT G. PARTRIDGE: Mr. President, Members of the Empire Club of Canada and Guests: I wish to thank your President, Mr. Brace, for this opportunity of addressing such a representative gathering on the occasion of my first appearance before a Canadian audience. I appreciate the responsibility in following a man like Mr. Carlyle and I am only too glad to know that I still have him with me in spirit and he would have been here today if he were not still basking in the sunlight of Nassau.

I know you are all familiar with the old saying that generalities are dangerous and that comparisons are odious. But in a brief talk to bring out the high-lights on my impressions as to conditions in America and Great Britain, I fear that both comparisons and generalities are necessary and I request your indulgence in these two respects.

Since the greater part of my life has been spent in the United States, with only seven years in Great Britain and only one year in Canada, I would not for one moment attempt to tell you gentlemen who know so much more of Canadian conditions in Canada than I do, what the actual conditions are here. Therefore, if my remarks seem too favourable toward conditions as I found them in Great Britain as compared to conditions on this side of the Atlantic, I might say, here in my short experience conditions and methods appear to occupy a position midway between those of Great Britain and the United States and therefore Canada can, to a great degree, take credit for any complimentary references made as to conditions over there and only to a lesser degree feel any criticism that may be made as to conditions here on this side of the water.

When one goes to a foreign land, such as France, Holland or Germany, speaking in an entirely different language, changes in customs, methods, dress and architecture are expected and are allowed for, but I do not believe in first going to Great Britain one is prepared for the variation there in manners, customs and methods and even in the use of the English language.

One small custom is the use of the words, lift instead of elevator, booking instead of making reservations, petrol instead of gasoline, lorry instead of truck, wings instead of fenders, silencers instead of mufflers. In addition the modulation or intonation of English voices is so entirely different, one has difficulty in understanding them, just as the English have difficulty understanding us, and I am not referring to communities in Wales and Ireland where practically no English is spoken, and the vernacular used in English countries, such as Lancashire, Staffordshire and Devonshire is as hard to understand as the Russian language would be. After some little time in England the American tongues seem to adapt themselves to the situation and I found I could understand the typical Englishmen and they seemed to understand me without difficulty. Far from finding the English hard to get acquainted with, both my family and I met with the most cordial hospitality throughout our years there. In fact, when I first went over, my American clothes were noticeable and while Englishmen, proverbially, never address one another without a formal introduction, on their own initiative they got into conversation on the trains and were extremely interested to hear about America and tell about England, and to put themselves out in order to offer assistance in any way possible.

One of the most noticeable of English attributes is the law-abiding character of the people. They are most jealous of liberties but do not confuse licence with liberty.

There is little state regulation of a paternalistic nature but laws are well administered and all seem content to obey them, knowing they affect all alike.

I had a good example immediately on my arrival. My family had a pet dog which they wanted to take to England. I learned that the dog had to go into quarantine for six months before he is released in the country. Six months is a long time in the life of a dog so I hesitated to take him. Friends told us that one of the English Directors surely would be able to "fix it" so I took him along. However, on arrival at Southampton the dog was met and escorted to the quarantine kennels. On my first visit to where he was detained I found two dogs serving six months which belonged to the King's uncle. So I made no effort to do any fixing. (Laughter.)

Another English characteristic is the love of fair play, in business deals, in sport and in every day life. I had an early sample of this also. When this same dog was released from quarantine and sent home he was naturally happy and excited over being allowed to run loose and he immediately broke into the chicken yard of one of my neighbours and killed 21 chickens before anything could be done about it. The chickens, unfortunately were fancy stock and very expensive. When I tried to pay for them, my neighbour would only allow me to pay half the cost, saying he felt partly responsible, that he should have had them better protected. Two or three years after I heard that the same day the dog also got into the chicken yard on the other side of the place but as we were newcomers and the chickens were ordinary fowl, nothing was said about that at all.

In going to an old country like England one has very frequently to change his point of view. For instance, the railways have practically no grade crossings, going under or over the roads and streets. Of course the roads, and people using the roads were there long before the railways and for the railways to secure franchise it was necessary for them to protect the users of the already established roads. In the newer countries the railways often come in advance of population and roads are built afterward when it is more difficult to adjust the cost of eliminating grade crossings.

I wonder how the merchants on Yonge or Bloor Street would feel if once or twice a week, farmers, pedlars, and hawkers came in front of their stores, erected stalls over half the sidewalk and part of the street, stopped everything but foot traffic and sold the same kind of goods at considerably lower prices, all without paying anything for the space occupied? This happens regularly in many small towns and boroughs in England with no comment on the part of the merchants. The answer is that the market was there years before the stores. Nothing is thought of it except by visitors.

I found business done in England on a somewhat less hectic basis than here. Hours start later, but they generally work a little later, so they put in about the same amount of time, not at quite such a high pressure. All business appointments are made in advance. Decisions are probably not arrived at quite so quickly but when a decision is made you can depend upon it and a definite plan for procedure is arranged. The plan is generally well executed. Less time is wasted in trying out schemes which might or might not succeed or which do not show definitely that they are along constructive lines.

The Englishman insists on holidays and the necessity must be urgent to get him to sacrifice his week-ends, which are usually from Friday night to Monday morning, but his holidays generally are a real change and a real rest. At the seashore, in his garden, playing golf or other games, or taking leisurely walks in the country.

In England, no one who can possibly do otherwise lives in the city. They love the country and spend every moment they can out of doors.

Their attitude on sports is not quite as competitive as ours, they play more for the sake of the game itself and seem more indifferent as to the final result.

While, as I said before, there seem to be comparatively few annoying laws, law suits are extremely expensive—perhaps that is why there are so few, or perhaps because there are few they are expensive. Disagreements are customarily settled by compromise between the parties concerned, or the parties select a referee and his decision is accepted. This spirit of compromise is sometimes misunderstood as it extends into national and international affairs.

At first glance their betting and liquor laws are certainly bewildering examples of compromise. Betting is legal on the race tracks, on certain set dates only, either through bookmakers or on pari-mutuel machines, referred to as 'totes,' illegal elsewhere with some exceptions, which make it more confusing. However, although the Englishman likes an occasional flutter, he does not usually gamble for high stakes. He has some of the characteristics of the canny Scot; two-and-six on a game of golf or a race is about the average bet. There is comparatively little speculation on the stock exchanges. Drinking is illegal during certain hours except in one's own home and as a result in hotels, restaurants and clubs, as well as in public houses or saloons, one cannot get a drink before 11.30 in the morning, between 3.00 and 5.30 in the afternoon and after certain hours at night—from 10.00 to 12.00 depending on the town, again with certain exceptions allowing late closing at the discretion of the magistrate. These laws are enforced and strictly lived up to by rich and poor alike. It is recognized that many people want beer, wine or hard liquor with their meals or after work for the day is over and all kinds of liquor can be readily obtained, but the law discourages drinking during working hours and little drunkenness is in evidence at any time.

The English climate is, of course, a constant topic of conversation and is much maligned, even by the Englishman, but frequent rain does not stop anything. Hiking, bicycling, sports, all go on just the same, no matter how wet it is and so much outdoor activity the year round certainly makes for health. Personally, I like the climate as they do not have the extremes of heat and cold that we do and with wool socks, heavy soled shoes and a mackintosh, one need not mind the English weather any time of the year.

There are four great holiday seasons in England, Christmas and Boxing Day, Easter Sunday and Monday, Whit-Sunday and Monday, and August Bank Holiday Monday, when it seems as though the entire population shifts from where it is to some other place. Railways put on all the extra trains the lines will carry. The roads are jammed with bicyclists travelling in parties, like swarms of bees, every motor car, truck and bus is out loaded to capacity and traffic crawls along for the two or three days these holidays are on. There is another holiday observed by the workers in Yorkshire and Lancashire, particularly, which is typical. During the summer months the various small manufacturing towns have what they call "Wake Weeks," different weeks for the various towns, when business shuts down for a week and all the workers go en masse to Blackpool, Harrowgate, Hull or some of the other northern resorts and enjoy their week at the seaside. The English generally have a profound belief in the efficacy of a few days cure at the sea whenever they are not feeling up to par.

Another outstanding characteristic is the general courtesy one meets with everywhere. The driver of a big truck makes it easy for one to pass on the road by drawing to one side and giving hand signals when the road is clear ahead. On the narrow winding roads it is almost impossible to pass another car safely except for this help. The London taxi driver on the main streets will stop and hold up traffic to help one to filter in from a side road. Imagine that happening in New York!

The police are always in evidence in both the cities and in the smallest villages and are always helpful and polite, even when giving you a summons for parking in the wrong place or for any other infraction of the law and anyone attempting to bribe a policeman not to do his duty is in serious difficulties. There is no speed limit for motor cars, except one of 30 miles per hour in built-up neighbourhoods, which has gone into effect this past year, but dangerous driving is severely penalized.

Great Britain has done more for general free education than other European countries and they are now debating in Parliament the possibility of increasing school leaving age from 14 to 15 years, both to give better education to the young people and to prevent the increase of unemployment. There are also a very considerable number of free scholarships which take care of young people showing exceptional ability, permitting even those from the poorest families to go through secondary or high school and even through the colleges and universities.

The Englishman takes his public duties very seriously. It is considered an honour to serve without pay on the borough, town, city or county council, or as alderman, mayor or magistrate and when a man becomes elderly or well enough off to retire or take time away from his business, as a matter of course he goes in for this sort of public work. As a result, the laws while strictly enforced are tempered with humanity and common sense. By this I do not mean that anyone with influence can secure favours, quite the contrary. The higher one's position or title, the more intelligent and responsible one is supposed to be and the more strictly is he held accountable for his actions. The poor or less responsible are given special consideration and the penalty made to fit the particular circumstances.

The rights of property and capital are always recognized and observed, both by the people and the Government, except that both property and income are subject to extremely heavy taxation. Industry is encouraged and helped to make profits. The good business man, as long as he abides by the rules of the game, is not considered a criminal but is respected and assisted and his ability is drafted for the good of his community or his country. That is quite different from some of the things that happen a little south of us right now.

The Civil Service offers a real career to many of the brightest graduates of the universities who take this up as their life work. It is a profession, the same as law or medicine. This has built up a corps of men who are secure in their positions and consequently collect the taxes, spend the governmental funds and generally administer the affairs of the Government intelligently, honestly, fairly and efficiently, regardless of the party in power, in accordance with the law.

Various newspapers there, like here, cater to different varieties of circulation, but all of them are held more responsible for what they print by very strict libel laws and laws which limit them severely as to publicity given to cases before the law courts. Generally, there is less yellow journalism, less scandal, and less intrusion into private affairs. The better papers, of course, give a wonderful synopsis of world news and this keeps the English public the best informed of any on world affairs.

It takes time and money to introduce a new article to the English market. It is harder to get customers there as the Englishman is slow to change. I think that is possibly the reason there have been some failures on the part of people on this side of the water in going over there and starting business and trying to make sales. High pressure advertising and salesmanship does not appeal but the right kind of consumer advertising and selling must be discovered and continued over a long period of time, for the dealer has a different attitude there than here. The dealer gives his customer what he wants and gets him what he asks for even though he may have something similar in stock. He is the agent for the customer rather than the manufacturer or wholesaler. His clients rather than his merchandise are his assets and this state of mind must be recognized to do business there. However, credit losses are small and bankruptcy is still considered a disgrace and is seldom encountered.

While English labour is not so well paid as American labour and does not have so high a standard of living, it is the highest paid in Europe and the cost of living is less —rent, food and clothes are all cheaper. In addition, with State, employers and employee contributing, English labour quite generally has unemployment insurance, health insurance, old age pensions, hospital and doctor's fees at a very low cost. This should always be taken into consideration in comparing our wages with those of England.

In Great Britain the trade unions are numerically stronger in many trades than they are over here, but again they are more responsible. They must make public their receipts and disbursements. There are no labour rackets nor irresponsible labour leaders stirring up trouble: and the laws determining legal and illegal picketing as well as other union activities are comprehensive and well enforced. Therefore, they are slow to strike and outside of the coal mining industry which, due to the loss of export trade and to the increased use of crude oil in place of coal is in the worst condition of any industry in England, there have been no threats of serious labour trouble since 1926, the year of the general strike. I might also say that the manufacturers and dealers are also permitted to organize under the union laws to protect their interests which is something that should be taken into consideration.

When I went to England in 1928, over here we were in the midst of our boom. Our high wages, due to the greatly increased use of modern machinery and mass production with our seeming prosperity, had made Englishmen commence to wonder if we had discovered some miraculous cure for all economic ills. While business conditions in England had been getting gradually worse ever since the beginning of the century, the war had postponed necessary action and since the war no Government had been strong enough to administer the drastic remedies required. They then had a socialist or labour government which seemed unwilling or unable to do anything constructive. They had an unbalanced budget, they were faced with going off the gold standard and they had a great number of unemployed who were being catered to in every way for political purposes. England had been on a free trade basis for many years. Free trade had been very advantageous as long as England was the principal manufacturing and shipping country of the world, exchanging her manufactured products for materials and foods, but since other countries had gone in for shipping and manufacturing both for themselves and for export, England was in a bad way. So bad that something had to be done about it and something, in fact many things were done. The emergency was recognized, all political differences and prejudices were forgotten, a National Government was formed and constructive moves were made which have shown an improvement there which is remarkable.

In the first place, confidence was restored by balancing the budget through severe economies in all governmental expenditures. As Ramsay McDonald phrased it, "Great Britain did not fall but slid off the gold standard." The administration of relief was put on a business basis. The cost of administration of relief, for example, was cut from 50% to 4½%. Those drawing relief, although not entitled to it, were eliminated and the use of relief money to influence political support was done away with. The unemployables and those in need, but not entitled to the dole under the Unemployment Insurance Act, were taken care of under the Poor Law which carries with it disenfranchisement as far as voting privileges are concerned.

Although heavy before, taxation was increased and more widely spread amongst the population. Income tax, for example, started at 25% on all incomes of approximately $1,000 a year and over and rapidly increased to 50% on larger incomes; 18c a gallon tax was put on gasoline and so on all along the line, but at the same time every effort was made to help business, so that the increased taxation was welcomed even by business men, who were consulted as to the situation that existed and as to the best way to raise and to collect taxes.

Free trade was done away with and tariffs were adjusted so that domestic manufacturers and farm products were protected against dumping and the English workingman against the lower standards of living existing in other countries, or from unfair competition from other countries through debased currencies and other ways. For example, the British steel business, with comparatively old plants had to meet competition from the most up-to-date plants in France and Belguim, built with reparation money from Germany to take the place of old plants which had been destroyed during the war.

When you consider that in addition to this kind of competition, England's wages generally were 50% higher than those of Belgium and one-third more than those of Germany, to say nothing of the much lower wages in other European countries, the absolute necessity for protection was evident.

A great slum clearance and small house building programme was started which gave immediate employment in many lines of industry, but please remember that all building done was of a permanent construction which will endure and at costs permitting rental or instalment buying prices which the people can afford to pay and that these buildings will eventually pay out as investments.

Since tariffs were imposed many new industries have located in England, helping to reduce the number of unemployed. During free trade, few of the newer kinds of manufactured articles had been made in England. For example, almost all of the new things that have come into existence during our life time were imported — pianos, automobiles, radios, typewriters, adding machines, office equipment, even spectacle frames and countless other articles were practically all imported. The manufacturers of English leather goods, considered for years the finest in the world, English luggage and hand baggage, all the metal fittings were imported. This condition is now changing rapidly as is very noticeaable in the many new factories seen throughout the Midlands and on the outskirts of London, and in the old factories which have been put back to work.

The tariffs are administered by a Commission which has power to act immediately and which is in session continuously. Tariffs can be and are adjusted frequently and quickly. I think they claim the record is seven minutes for a tariff revision when brought before the Commission and handled by it. It is only necessary to show that articles are being imported which can be made in Great Britain or for which substitutes can be provided from within the country to get action.

Pressure has been put upon all countries which in the past have been selling to Great Britain more than they have bought, by various methods, quotas and so forth either to increase their purchases or cut down their sales; for in the long run a country's total imports and exports must be balanced just as the budget.

Thus, in a few short years, Great Britain has changed from a free trade country to the one which is using tariffs the most intelligently and effectively of all, and is further demonstrating how, by the old proven methods, instead of by experimenting with theoretical panaceas and quack remedies the world can really start back on the road to recovery.

I feel today that Great Britain is the best governed country in the world. (Applause.) There they are keeping their feet on the ground, confining their efforts to the most important job at hand in any country—getting their people back to work. They are neither looking for an easy way out, nor trying to introduce too many reforms which, however desirable they sound, no country can afford to introduce under present chaotic conditions.

I hope to make my permanent home in Canada. (Applause.) Looking ahead, I believe with our present small population, our immense territory, our natural wealth, the opportunities are greater here than in any other country—if we all work together, thinking straight and refusing to be led up blind alleys by theorists and experimentalists, many of whom have nothing to lose and by attempting to set class against class, are confusing the issue and retarding recovery.

Pessimists say civilization is crumbling because the machinery for international relations was interrupted, dislocated and in many cases destroyed during the war. Yet, a study of history will show that every great war, as far back as the records go, had these same effects, yet civilization has continually approached a higher standard. The aftermath from the last war, with which we are still contending, is only intensified because of the number of nations and people involved and the correspondingly greater need for each nation to put its own house in order and meet the situation.

It is encouraging that never before after a world tragedy, such as the Great War, have so many people appreciated the futility of war. Never has there been so wide-spread an interest in the welfare of their fellow citizens, never has there been such an immediate dissemination of news by telegraph, telephone, cable and radio which provide for relatively quick application of the proper remedies.

When so many countries are showing signs of disintegration, in spite of frantic struggles to avoid facing the real issues, by reviving medieval prejudices and superstitions—by gambling their all on either long since discredited or brand new theories of politics and economics—by turning over to dictators the freedom of the individual which it took centuries of struggle and bloodshed to obtain, can we not here in Canada take the information which is available, sift the good from the bad, the facts from the propaganda, the sensible from the insane, the straight from the crooked, the immediate necessities from the present superfluities, the advantages from the disadvantages of democracy and by the same machinery and methods which have advanced human progress more in the past hundred years than in the thousands of years preceding, also set an example to the world for clear-sightedness, self-discipline and real character which will place us in the forefront of civilized nations. The law of gravity, the law of supply and demand, the law of self-preservation, the law of the survival of the fittest cannot be changed by words, by ignoring them or by trying to side-step them. If we work with these natural laws, not against them, we will commence to see results and the kind of results we are hoping for.

Thank you. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT: I hope none of you will feel we have misrepresented the address that was to be given today when we entitled it "Conditions in Great Britain and the United States." I think our guest speaker has been extremely clever in not making any comparisons between what is going on in Great Britain and what is going on elsewhere. He has left that for us.

Any copyright which The Empire Club may have to addresses presented before its members is withdrawn in so far as this address is concerned. I think that as an American-born, a long time resident in Britain, Mr. Partridge would be a fine ambassador from Canada to go to the United States and tell a story of this nature, either by word of mouth or by the issue of a pamphlet covering this address.

On your behalf, and on behalf of the listeners on the radio, I extend to Mr. Partridge our very sincere thanks for this very lucid address and also again wish him God-speed as long as he remains in this country and we trust it will be, as he says, for the rest of his life. (Applause.)

KIPLING, THE POET OF EMPIRE

AN ADDRESS BY REVEREND GEORGE C. PIDGEON, D.D.

Thursday, April 9th, 1936

PRESIDENT BRACE: For the benefit of our radio audience, I would like to say The Empire Club of Canada has just conducted its Annual Meeting and elected officers for the ensuing year. Major Gordon B. Balfour has been elected President and takes office on May 1st, next.

Today, I am going to ask Dr. George H. Locke, Chief Librarian of the Public Libraries, to introduce our guest speaker. Dr. Locke.

DR. GEORGE H. LOCKE: Mr. President, Mr. Speaker and Fellow Members of The Empire Club: I count this a very great honour to come to you today to present to you one of our most distinguished citizens who is going to speak to you about the most distinguished man in the British Empire, because, after all, Prime Ministers come and go and Generals come and go, men die in bed and elsewhere and they pass on, but the poet, the author, remains. Why? Because they create characters and those characters remain and you and I are acquainted with them down through the ages and they never die. I suppose we shall never get rid of Stalkey, never get rid of Mulvaney, and many characters Kipling created and that is exactly, as you all know, what made Dickens famous. And it is rather interesting to note at the last, the man who created so many characters in real life is lying beside the man who created more, for Dickens and Kipling lie beside each other in Westminster Abbey, and when the King of England died, King George V, the same week he died, he took with him, Kipling, the trumpeter of the British Empire. (Applause.)

Dr. George C. Pidgeon: Thanks, Mr. Chairman and Dr. Locke, for an introduction like this to my visible audience and my invisible audience and you won't be surprised if there are certain individuals in the invisible audience in whom I am particularly interested at this time.

Anyone who wants to speak on Kipling ought to begin with Kipling and let me, in beginning, offer a substitute for the apology I notice speakers so often make when they are beginning an address like this:

When 'Omer smote 'is bloomin' lyre,
He'd 'eard men sing by land an' sea;
An' what he thought he might require,
'e went and took, the same as me.

The market girls an' fishermen
The shepherds an' the sailors too
They 'eard old songs turn up again
But kep' it quiet—same as you.

They knew 'e stole, 'e knew they knowed
They didn't tell nor make a fuss
But winked at 'Omer down the road,
An' 'e winked back—the same as us!

(Applause.)

Now, there we are. And the one who would speak on Kipling gives up all hope of being original in any respect, whatever. But just let me make a personal explanation. I am not sure but what it is my love for the lyric that brings me closest to this poet of Empire. I learned it in very early childhood from my mother's love for Robert Burns and so strong was the hold of the lyric on my mind as a youth that it took me a long time to cultivate any sort of appreciation for our great dramatists and epic poets, and this man with the music in his poetry had from the very earliest of his publications caught my imagination and also brought forth a response from, I think, that which was deepest in me. If you think of such poems as, above all, "The Song of The Banjo," "Fuzzy-Wuzzy," "Danny Deever," "The Road to Mandalay," and many others one might mention, you can understand the music of the verse that holds so many minds enthralled.

But then I mustn't stay to speak critically of this man's poetry. What I want to do is to bring home some of the things that appeal to the plain man, that is the ordinary reader of Kipling who isn't able to go back of the poems to study up the innumerable technical references that this writer makes. First as a preacher, may I just draw your attention to this man's love for the English Bible. His very thought seems rooted in that majestic old classic and if you look at the titles, such titles as "Dives," "The Sons of Mary and the Sons of Martha," "The Prodigal Son," the "Modern Version," and others of that class, you will see the truth of the remark that the Scripture which makes Miss Rossetti wistful and moves Tennyson to sing cadences, stirs in Kipling a sense of its message as an outdoor book calling to high achievement and attainment.

Now, his comments on the Scriptures aren't always exactly orthodox, perhaps to some of us they are the more interesting on that account. For instance, I picked the following out of "The Prodigal Son," this morning, just as I was coming away:

Here come I to my own again,
Fed, forgiven and known again,
Claimed by bone of my bone again
And cheered by flesh of my flesh.
The fatted calf is dressed for me
But the husks have greater zest for me
I think my pigs will be best for me
So I'm off to the styes afresh.

Amusing? Perhaps. Tragic? Still more so. But I can name some of the men.

And then not only did he bring out sides of the truth that the ordinary student is liable to overlook but when

Kipling was moved to the depths you got in his message the ring of the prophecies of the olden time that stirs the soul and moves to high action. Some of you will remember that striking poem that he published just after the tragedy of 1914, and the appeal that the chorus made to us in those terrible days:

Though all we know depart, the old commandments stand
In courage keep your heart, in strength lift up your hand.

Well, first of all, he is the poet of the Empire, the patriot, the one who caught the spirit of his country and sang forth its message to the world. In speaking of Kipling as the patriot, we think first of all of his love of the land. Not to speak of his love for his own India to which he owed so much and which gave him such a marvellous opportunity, there is love for English soil which he had made his own and in a poem like "Sussex," he brings that out with all his strength. But what strikes me as a Canadian as I read his poetry is the way in which he catches the spirit of our land and sings of the things that appeal to the deepest in our nature. Now, I imagine one of the most beautiful of his poems to us all is, "The Flowers," that begins, "Buy my English posies," but who of us born in Canada can forget the first chorus in that poem, and by the way, there is no season of the year when it comes home to us as it does at the present minute:

Robin, down the logging road, whistles "Come to me!"
Spring has found the maple grove, the sap is running free.
All the winds of Canada call the ploughing rain,
Take the flower and turn the hour, and kiss your love again!

And some of us who were brought up alongside of those marvellous fishing rivers of the east with all they mean to sportsmen across the world are grateful to Kipling for this stanza in "The Feet of the Young Men:"

Do you know the blackened timber—do you know that racing stream
With the raw, right-angled log-jam at the end;
And the bar of sun-warmed shingle where a man may bask and dream
To the click of shod canoe-poles round the bend?
It is there that we are going with our rods and reels and traces
To a silent, smoky Indian that we know,
To a couch of new-pulled hemlock, with the starlight on our faces,
For the Red Gods call us on and we must go!

There you have the very picture of the eastern Canadian river and I, from my own memory, can match every single turn in those splendid lines.

Then, he has a strong sense of the achievements of his fellow countrymen. It often seems to me the very spirit of the Elizabethans gets into Kipling as he speaks of the world exploration and world conquest. There, of course, we think first of all of "The Song of The English," and, Mr. Chairman, I can't tell you how strong has been the appeal of that verse the late J. A. MacDonald used to love to repeat over and over in his really great speeches:

We have fed our sea for a thousand years
And she calls us, still unfed
Though there's never a wave of all her waves
But marks our English dead;
We have strawed our best to the weed's unrest,
To the shark and the sheering gull,
If blood be the price of admiralty,
Lord God, we ha' paid in full.

Then, he has a sense of the mission of his people to the world. Perhaps he expresses that most strongly in his poem, "Take up the White Man's Burden." Now, there is a great deal of, I was going to say nonsense—it is worse than nonsense—talked about the white man's burden. In order to see the idea the populace gets out of the white man's burden put in its proper place, you had to listen to Professor Morrison, late of Queen's University, and the way in which Morrison talked about men who made the bearing of the white man's burden an excuse for exploiting the backward races would open our eyes to quite a few of the defects in our British patriotism. There is a great deal in that sort of talk that is hollow and selfish and utterly unworthy. One cannot forget in this the humiliation and despair of an African like Aggrey, in many respects the greatest of his race, as he thought of the way they were shut out from the opportunities of that great land by some who talked of bearing the white man's burden. But when all allowance is made for that, he and his people have had a mission to the world. Some one said a little while ago that Britain gave Egypt water and justice. Well, those of us who know the story of that long struggle realize that the gift of water and justice to countries like Egypt and India have been of vital importance that history will place a good deal higher than we are placing it today. (Applause.) And that sense of the Briton's mission and what his sense of justice when rightly expressed has meant to the world, Kipling brings out in another striking stanza in that "Song of the English:"

Keep ye the law
Be swift in all obedience
Clear the land of evil, drive the road and bridge the ford
Make ye sure to each his own
That he shall reap where he hath sown,
By the peace among Our peoples let men know we serve the Lord.

Now, it is that sense of the Briton's mission for which we are grateful to this man and not only did he express it but he stirred us to the fullest realization of its importance. Then, remember, that that poem, "The Song of the English," was written back in 1903, or rather was published in 1903, and when you look at the conclusion of that poem in the light of the tragedy of the World War, you can realize the significance of this prophecy that he makes for his own people, expressing what at that time was deepest in us:

Also We will make promise, so long as the Blood endures
I shall know that your good is mine; ye shall feel that my strength is yours
In the day of Armageddon, at the last great fight of all,
That Our House shall stand together and the pillars do not fall.

Then, in order to appreciate his greatness we must think of him as the interpreter of the mind of his time. I do not think he could interpret the mind of our time. I do not think he could appreciate all that enters into the mind and heart of the youth that were growing up around him in those latter days in England but he did interpret the mind of his own people away back in the nineties, when I recall first hearing of his poems. No, when I first heard of them it was back in '88, and for two decades after the spirit of the Empire was his to express in ringing verse and we in Canada but little realize the breadth of his outlook.

Now, I recall one of our most brilliant students from Ontario being sent to an Island in the Gulf of Georgia for the summer and from that island he could see, day by day, the great ships passing out to the Orient and to the south. He told me after that one could never realize the broadening of vision that meant to him. He was brought up in a little town in this province and then went out to that far west with its world connections and he said it simply lifted him to a new conception of our relationship with the outside world. Some of us who had lived for years in that far west with its relations with the Orient and the south, went over to England in the fall of 1912 and lived there for four or five months, trying to catch the spirit of the people found that we were provincial compared with those Britishers. They had a world outlook. They had a sense of world citizenship that put our views to shame and it was that they just lifted our eyes to a consciousness of the Briton's mission to all mankind. Here is a family—one daughter living in Hong Kong, another daughter living in Chili, another on the west coast of North America. Here is a friend of mine going to see his daughter and he visits her in the Port of Shanghai. No matter where you went, you were in contact with families whose vital connections were world-wide.

Now, it is that spirit that Kipling expresses and he lifts all who are open to his suggestions to a sense of the vastness of the influence that our people wield and, after all, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Club, the greatest of our men is the one who interprets the mind of his time. When we talk about the original thinker we think of some one who brings out some new thoughts that were never in the minds of men before. In reality, the original thinker is the one who catches the spirit of his own age and gives it clear expression. The original and creative thinking of our time is done not in the study; it is done by men of action out in the world of men, contending with the forces that are bringing in a new day and the prophet that every generation needs is one who will catch that spirit and give expression to those thoughts and put in words that none can fail to hear and none can ever forget the message of his people to the world and to the future. (Applause.)

Now, that is what Kipling did. It was because of that he had such a hold and such a profound influence on the men of his time. And there is one message that we need from Kipling in our day and that is the strength of the individual, his resources, his possibilities, and you never could get out of Kipling the idea that man is made by his environment. To Kipling the man shaped the environment. That is what he got his manhood for. You remember this striking couplet in "The Mary Gloster," where the old man is telling the son of his achievements in the maritime world of his time:

They copied all they could follow but they couldn't
copy my mind,
And I left 'em sweating and stealing, a year and a half
behind

There is Kipling's conception of the man, the man who shaped the world:

They copied all they could follow but they couldn't
copy my mind,
And I left 'em sweating and stealing, a year and a half
behind.

I heard a literary critic say the other day that Kipling's "If" wasn't poetry. Well, perhaps it isn't. So, let's call it preaching if you will, but it is wonderful preaching, and it is a wonderful setting of a message of the old stoic, that a man should be independent of his environment, neither unduly exalted nor elated by success, nor unduly depressed by failure, but preserving an evenness of spirit through all the changes of his outward fortune. I will not attempt to read that or anything from it because it is so familiar to us all, but it has deeply influenced many of the youth of the day. I saw a teacher of youth the other day who had up in his office a copy of Kipling's "If," and he said there were certain conditions of boy life with which he had to deal for which that was the very best treatment he knew and many of us feel it has profoundly influenced us in older days.

Then, in speaking of the individual and the individual's power, he didn't ignore the individual's relationship with his associates. He is the poet of comradeship. Who that ever lived in the army can miss it?

God send us a trusty chum
If he's liquor, he'll give me some,
If I'm dying he'll hold my head
And write 'em home when I am dead
God send us a trusty chum.

And:

Now this is the law of the jungle—as old and as true
as the sky,
And the wolf that shall keep it may prosper and the
wolf that shall break it must die
As the creeper that girdles the tree trunk the law
runneth forward and back,
For the strength of the pack is the wolf and the
strength of the wolf is the pack.

(Applause.)

We are hearing a great deal these days, perhaps a little too much, about fraud in connection with relief. Gentlemen, that is not what I am afraid of. That is a small thing and can be easily dealt with. What I am afraid of is the slackening of effort that is going on around us where men lean on society instead of feeling that society gets its strength and its resources from each man seeing his place and part and doing that part with all his might. That is our difficulty today. That is where this man brings us such a vital message through the years. I am sure you have all noticed the attitude of the great souls of literature toward the slacker or the neutral. You find it first in the Book of Revelations: "Because thou art neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth." You find it in Dante. Dante pictures just inside the gates of hell, the neutrals, the people who were not good enough for Heaven, but were not positive enough for hell. They could never take a stand while they were in the flesh, therefore they are always on the move, going round and round in a circle that can never stop, and so terrible is the monotony of their existence that even the positive suffering of the lower circles of perdition to them would be a positive relief. If you want a modern statement of that idea you find it in Browning's poem, "The Statue and the Bust." He there deliberately takes an instance where the suggestion was to crime and shows that the failure to take the opportunity when it came took all the colour out of life. He says:

The sin I impute to each frustrate ghost
Is the unlit lamp and the ungirt loin—

And speaking of those people, he adds:

Only they see not God, I know,
Nor all that chivalry of His,
The soldier-saints who row on row
Burn upward, each to his point of bliss.

Now, Kipling catches that idea in "Tomlinson." Tomlinson is a man who never did any harm and because he never did any harm thought himself sure of admission inside the pearly gates. When he got there, St. Peter, with his positiveness, had no place for him. There was no scope for a colourless creature such as he in the better world, so he sent him down below and when he went down below he had a still severer examination before his Satanic Majesty and speaking to him, Satan says this:

The Devil he blew on a brandered soul and set it aside to cool:
"Do ye think I would waste my good pit-coal on the hide of a brain-sick fool?
"I see no worth in the hobnailed mirth or the jolthead jest ye did
"That I should waken my gentlemen that are sleeping three on a grid.

Now, that is the attitude of all militant spirits toward the colourless man, the man who has nothing positive to stand for and nothing definite to do and whose claim to distinction is that simply he never did any harm. Dante, Browning, Kipling and, above all, the author of the Book of Revelation, have simply no place for such as he.

Then, he sings the song of the brave and strong all over the world:

There dwells a wife by the northern gate
And a wealthy wife is she;
She breeds a breed of roving men
And casts them over the sea.

The good wife's sons come home again
With little into their hands
But the lore of men that have dealt with men
In the new and naked lands.

But the faith of men that have brothered men
By more than easy breath
And the eyes of men that have read with men
In the open books of Death.

And following up that great idea of achievement that seeks not gain nor anything that self can desire you have that amazing "Ballad of the East and the West," with its still more striking introduction:

Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain
shall meet,
Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God's great
judgment seat;
But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed,
nor Birth,
When two strong men stand face to face, tho' they
come from the ends of the earth!

Back of the message of the individual there is the sense of the inspiration that comes to men, that light from beyond himself that lightens a man's eyes and lets him see things that are hidden from the rest of mankind and the poem that struck me most forcibly from that point of view was "The Explorer." Perhaps that is one of the more recent of Kipling's really striking contributions. He pictures this man as settled and prosperous, but while he is moving on, as far as his neighbours could see, successfully, he says:

Till voice as bad as Conscience rang interminable
changes
On one everlasting Whisper, day and night repeated—
so:
'Something hidden. Go and find it—Go and look
behind the ranges—
'Something lost behind the Ranges, lost and waiting
for you—Go!

Then, there is the story of how he left all and went, of the struggle with nature's forces that almost drove him insane and then the discovery of an Empire with wooded mountains and valleys, with rich plains, with everything that man could desire inviting him to go in and take possession and then he sums the whole thing up this way:

Yes, your 'Never-never country'—yes, "your edge of cultivation"
And "no sense in going further"—till I cross the range to see,
God forgive me! No, I didn't. It's God's present to our nation,
Anybody might have found it but—His whisper came to me.

And the story just reminded me of something that Morse said when an ardent young admirer was talking to him about his discoveries and he said this: "Well, you know, I never feel like taking any credit for them. Time and again I have faced a blank wall with no opportunity that I could see of either getting through it or getting around it—" And then, his young friend said, "You prayed?" "Yes, and the answer came and when I have been given credit for my discoveries I always feel like saying they are not mine, they have been given to me in the interests of mankind"—and I wonder if in our skeptical age we realize how much we in this modern practical world owe our practical achievements to an inspiration that came from beyond ourselves, and to this Kipling gave magnificent expression in that poem entitled, "The Burial," that you recall was written on the passing of Cecil Rhodes:

Dreamer, devout, by vision led
Beyond our guess or reach
The travail of his spirit bred
Cities in place of speech,
So huge the all-mastering thought that drove—

So brief the term allowed—
Nations, not words, he linked to prove
His faith before the crowd.

Then, back of all that is the deep religious spirit he brings out in so many. Again, as I said in another connection, it is not always in the orthodox way. That picture he gives of McAndrew, of McAndrew's faith and the change that came in the secrets of McAndrew's life, that throttling temptation to sanctify the flesh, the way he overcame it and then the covenant that followed and you remember the ringing expression that he gives to his faith as he, a mechanic, lives in a love, almost poetic, of his machinery:

From coupler-flange to spindle-guide, I see Thy Hand,
O God—
Predestination in the stride o' yon connectin'-rod.

A question our age is asking today as it never did before.

Then, if you want to go to the example of all others—I haven't time to quote from "Mulholland's Contract"—it is one of the most fascinating stories I know of personal transformation and the way in which that may find expression. I should just like to close this all too superficial review of one whose works we love by that—shall I call it swan song?—well, it is as much to Kipling as "Crossing the Bar" is to Tennyson, and it gives expression to his faith, even though it came to him in the early years of his poetic career:

When earth's last picture is painted,
And the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colours have faded
And the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and faith we shall need it,
Lie down for an eon or two
Till the Master of all good workmen
Shall set us our work anew.

And only the Master shall praise us
And only the Master shall blame
And no one shall work for money
And no one shall work for fame,
But each for the joy of working
And each in his separate star
Shall paint the thing as he sees it,
For the God of things as they are.

(Hearty applause.)

PRESIDENT: Last week we had Partridge for luncheon. Today we have had Pidgeon, and it has been a real substantial luncheon.

Dr. Pidgeon has brought Kipling to us and I think we all know him better than when he came into the banquet hall. I think as time goes on Kipling will rest beside Dickens and Shakespeare in the studies of the youth and the studies of those of us who are older. He has been a wonderful man in this great Empire of ours and I believe his work will go on in the years to come.

On your behalf I extend to Dr. Pidgeon our very sincere thanks for coming to us today and presenting such an able address, a presentation of Kipling that I think well warrants repitition when the opportunity comes.

THE NEXT FIVE YEARS IN CANADA

AN ADDRESS BY MR. FLOYD S. CHALMERS

Thursday, April 16th, 1936

MR. H. C. BOURLIER: Gentlemen: Your Executive take great pleasure in bringing to you today a gentleman who is very well known, indeed, and I should say, really needs no introduction whatsoever. However, there are certain things concerning his past which perhaps you may not be familiar with and I am going to take the liberty of referring to one or two just in passing by.

We first made his aquaintance at an early age in Orillia, where he lived and received his early education. Subsequently, after engaging in various pursuits, a little grocery business and banking, and finally after reporting on two newspapers, we find him with *The Financial Post*. Then, eleven years ago, if his biographer be correct, he assumed the position of Editor.

Mr. Chalmers has always been a keen student of economics and is greatly interested in the promotion of good and stable government. He is a patron of the arts, Vice-Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Toronto Conservatory of Music, and also Vice-Chairman of the Canadian Society of International Affairs. He is a member of our own Empire Club for which we are very proud indeed and in justice to our sister club, the Canadian Club, may I say, he is a past President of that organization.

Mr. Chalmers' topic today is "The Next Five Years in Canada," and I hope he may have good news for us and that he may be a dependable prophet. I take pleasure in introducing to you, Mr. Floyd Chalmers.

MR. FLOYD S. CHALMERS: Mr. Chairman, Fellow Members of the Empire Club of Canada: I feel it is a very great honour for a humble member of this Club to be invited to speak. It makes of this gathering something of a family party; as I look around the room and see so many of my own personal friends here, I feel very much at home.

Before I enter into a discussion of my subject, I should like to extend my congratulations to Major Gordon Balfour, who was last week elected President of this Club. (Applause.) I think, too, I should extend my congratulations to the Club upon the election of Major Balfour. I am certain that the Club is destined to have a very busy and fruitful year under his direction.

Now, to my subject. First, let us look over the current scene a little bit. I think it is fair to say Canada is making, at the moment, reasonable progress toward recovery and enjoying almost what we might call creeping prosperity. At what point recovery ends and prosperity begins, I, for one, am hardly qualified to say. You know, we here in Canada have not quite outgrown our boomster instincts. We think of Canada as a young country and we claim for Canada the privilege of indulging in the enthusiasms of youth. We don't seem to think the pot is boiling normally until the lid is in danger of being blown off. Just about the time our bank presidents and life insurance companies' general managers are beginning to throw out cautionary and restraining hints of possible trouble ahead, the average business man may be induced to admit that business is getting to be "pretty good."

In my title, "The Next Five Years in Canada," the word five is rather arbitrarily chosen. I don't know how I got it—perhaps from the recent book, "The Next Five Years" published in Great Britain. Perhaps I was influenced by the fact that Mr. Thomas Bradshaw spoke recently on a similar subject. I have taken the figure five very arbitrarily and I do not intend to attempt to fix the date either of the next boom or of the next collapse. I do think, at the moment, that it is not unreasonable for us to speak in terms of optimistic forwardness. The major evil we have to guard against, of course, is war, and there is little we can do in that respect. Barring war—which would indeed be a major evil for Canada—present portents are favourable for at least another five years of continued progress in reconstruction, a period of reconstruction which would lead, may we pray and hope, to the threshold of a new era of population growth, of capital development, of enhanced standards of living for all the people. Thus, the pressure of the crisis has been lifting, is lifting and promises to continue to lift. This enables us to explore the possibilities of introducing a little more of the spirit of purposeful direction into our recovery so we shall be in a better position to face whatever is going to be our future.

As a result of these upward struggles of the last few years we have been brought out of the deepest pit of the depression. But haven't we reason to think furiously on the type of recovery we are having? We still have one and a third millions of people on relief. The first provincial bond default of history has come, not in 1931 or '32, but in 1936, the fourth year of recovery. Our railway losses are continuing almost at peak level. Taxes are at a new high and public budgets generally are not in balance.

Such depression symptoms persist and we must recognize them. But I do not think they need to stir in us a feeling of futility and disappointment, for there is another side to the medal.

In Canada we have very little love or regard for force or fascism. We rate very highly our privilege of representative government and individual liberty and the opportunity for self-realization under a form of representative government. Yet, as we treasure the advantages that we enjoy under Democracy, we have to be very realistic about its shortcomings. Not the least of these shortcomings is the hesitancy of any democratic form of government to take direct action to meet what the schooled or tutored mind seems to recognize as very clear cut situations. Throughout the years of depression practically all the democratic governments of the world, Canada not excepted, have temporized with their economic and social problems. They have wasted precious days in the pursuit of political phantoms. We have seen in Canada whole masses of people ranging themselves behind crusading demagogues who carry aloft the torch of economic lunacy.

The depression came first to Great Britain. Great Britain, too, as if to demonstrate that it was a true democracy, failed for a number of years to come to grips with its problems. Eventually public opinion discovered and insisted upon the unpleasant but essential, "first things first," and Britain was quickly on the way out.

I think, as we look around this country, we can see some evidence that the period of dodging the essential tasks, of shifting, of indecision, of pursuing the fallacies instead of the facts, is beginning to pass.

To me the really encouraging news we read in the papers from day to day is not the news that another mill has been opened here, or a factory has taken on more hands there, or a dividend has been raised, or that the business index has climbed another point or two. Rather, to me, the really encouraging news is that type which we are now seeing increasingly, such as this: That Ottawa has set itself a two-year programme of budget balancing. That the Ontario Government has decided it must peg its debt at the present level. Or that Toronto, as it did the other day, has taken steps to take several hundred racketeers off the relief roll.

The other day, there was actually one member of Parliament who supported the closing of a customs office in his town, and moreover went into his constituency and justified his action on the ground of economy. I should mention his name, it was R. J. Deachman. It was a very courageous thing to do.

These things are straws in the wind and they do present evidence that representative government, that Democracy, in Canada is beginning to buckle down to business, to look at its problems with intellectual candour and political honesty.

Now, the only kind of recovery we should be satisfied with, that means anything at all, is a recovery which is going to see long strides made toward the solution of our underlying political and economic problems. A recovery that merely covered them up would be dangerous and ultimately very costly. We have had in the past periods of great expansion which simply served to gloss over growing evils in our structure.

Take, for instance, the problem of social dependency. Ever since the beginning of the century we have been faced in Canada with a rising tide of social dependency. Our population, it would seem, is getting older, and the fact we have to face is that no recovery we are likely to enjoy is going to remove all of the present relief recipients from a position of dependence upon the public purse. Yet the problem is not one that is solely the product of the recent depression. It is one that has been developing for many years and one we have been most happy to ignore. We have refused to plan in a scientific manner our attack upon it. We have given very little serious public study in Canada to, for instance, the contributory principle in social insurance; to distinguishing between those who cannot work and those who will not work; to what social legislation we cannot afford and what social legislation we cannot afford to do without. Paternalism has grown in this country and the worst feature is this: it has grown haphazardly as well as expensively.

Similarly, it seems, with the railway problem. The railway problem we cannot honestly regard as a product of the 1929-1931 economic collapse. The railway problem has been developing in this country all throughout my lifetime, at least. The railway problem, I suppose, was born in contractors' rackets before the war, it was nursed on war-time temporizing, weaned to the more solid food of post-war politics and raised to full stature in the unthinking twenties, when we all pretended that our real problem was not too much railway investment, but too little.

Another era of prosperity, taken by itself, will not automatically solve the railway problem. In fact, if we pursue the same policies we have in the past, prosperity will only make the railway problem greater and much more difficult.

We have had booms in the past, booms of different sorts, and we have seldom used them consciously to clean up our major economic problems. At this moment we are looking forward to a few years of steadily improving trade and of expanding national revenues, of re-employment and of some relief from relief and public deficits. We ought to ask ourselves this question: How wisely are we going to plan our way through, In short, are the next five years in Canada going to be years of bickering drift to recovery or of shrewdly directed attack upon our major problems?

Now, what are some of the problems to which I refer? problems that demand the consideration of a well-informed public? Well, they are manifold. You could name a dozen, or twenty. In a short address such as this it is possible to make reference to only two or three of them, and very inadequate, brief reference to each of those.

Now, the first problem I should like to discuss is that of Re-employment. Sustenance is the pivot around which human life revolves and, that being so, I feel that few of you will question that our primary objective must be to re-employ productively all our citizens who are capable of producing. I referred a moment ago to the permanent load of social dependency we must continue to carry in Canada. It is gratifying that Ottawa is beginning to face up to the facts of unemployment and to make some attempt to divide the relief rolls into those who only need jobs and those who will always need assistance.

How are we going to put scores of men and women, scores of thousands of men and women, back to work? Here is a country that still boasts virgin resources and opportunities. It would take many more workers and potential workers than we have in this country to keep even our present producing plant running at full capacity and it would require a greatly increased machine of production to supply the possible reasonable demands of our people.

So it seems to me the point to start from in any discussion of this subject of re-employment is this: that it is possible to find jobs for all employable citizens in Canada. It seems to me there could be no idea more absurd than the idea that there is not enough work to go around.

The second consideration I would like to keep in mind in discussing the subject of re-employment is this: we want this country to remain, and develop further, as a country of high living standards for all classes of producers and workers. But it is ridiculous to think any nation can maintain high living standards when a large percentage of its population is not producing. I ask that both of those thoughts be kept in mind in anything I say.

In a state controlled by a political dictator, it is not very difficult to solve the problem of unemployment by direct action. Wages can be fixed and relative prices can be set, jobs can be created for one class of people in the community at the expense of another class of people in the country. A war can be fought, if necessary, or heavy armaments built to make work. In a Democracy, quick, direct control of employment is, we must admit, much more difficult. But what a Democracy can and must do, and about the only thing it can do, is to create the conditions under which production and employment will develop naturally and rapidly. To the extent that we can control it ourselves, apart from external influences, rapid re-employment of our citizens in Canada must, in my opinion, be largely the product of restored confidence, of individual initiative seeking adventure and reward, and of substantial freedom for enterprise from the dictation of either the visionary or the bureaucratic mind.

A major cure for much of unemployment is, of course, to re-establish the traditional incentives to work and to reaffirm our faith in reasonable rewards for the adventuresome enterprise that creates employment. Then, having ensured that incentives to effort are not absent, it becomes largely a question of stimulating the exchange of labour through putting buyer and seller on a swapping basis.

So, we have to ask ourselves these question: can the consumer in Canada and abroad exchange what he has to offer for the products of our labour, Are certain costs too high, Are some groups grasping at the shadow of a higher standard of living and losing the substance of it? Are there inequalities and rigidities in the price structure, in wages, in freight rates, in tariffs, in taxes, that set up very serious obstacles to re-employment and the exchange of goods?

As we chart our way to busier factories and fuller dinner pails, we should endeavour to remove some of these obstacles instead of thinking of ways and means of adding new ones. Industrial codes, public works programmes, government regulations of one kind and another, if they are not skilfully devised, may have the opposite effect of that intended by their sponsors, actually setting up barriers to further employment, rather than stimulating it.

Many of the plans for re-employment that have been offered contain one basic fallacy—at least to me it is a basic fallacy—that they ask some one group in the community to pay for ensuring some other group a job or a certain minimum income. It would be far better for us to seek the policies that will increase the net total of production and exchange of goods and services. To rob Peter to pay Paul does not give Paul a job and does not make both men wealthier. You can't have a community in which you are spoonfeeding everyone. There must be some one out rustling for his own keep.

Those are my general comments on the subject of re-employment and I have set down what I considered to be the basic principles. I have given no panacea, not even an attempt at offering a palliative, but it seems to me that is the blue-print we must follow in solving the unemployment problem.

Now, if the first of our tasks is to turn idleness into productivesness, I don't think we can put further down on the list than second the problem of public debt. We are all aware that chains and burdens of public debt manacle and bind us and restrict our freedom to handle other problems. They add further rigidities to our economic life. Constantly growing fixed charges add very greatly to the competitive production costs of Canadian producers and make trade more difficult than it should be.

I refer to debt because debt is the core of the whole problem of public finance. Our public debts have actually, in my opinion, passed a reasonably supportable level in this country. If you accept this then you must accept my next statement, that our course is clear and it must be to peg our public debt—that is to say, to check the rise of debt—and, secondly, to take steps to reduce the total. Any economic panacea or political programme for recovery that does not plan for an ultimate reduction, rather than an increase in our public debt should be regarded with suspicion, because ultimately, it is likely to prove unsound and destructive. Most of the palliatives and panaceas offered do suffer from that defect. They have been compounded with one fundamental thought: their acceptance and application implies more public borrowing, when most of us in this room know that the desperate need is to put a stop to unproductive public borrowing. Our public debt amounts approximately to $3,000 on every home in the country. The existence of this very large mortgage on our farms and firesides is the chief reason why the annual cost of government in Canada has risen to $10. a week for every home in Canada.

As a matter of fact, we have not yet felt the full impact of the rapid increase in debt in the post-war years. The chief reason is that as our debts have risen, interest rates have been going down so that the burden of interest has not grown as rapidly as the burden of debt itself.

We have come to the point where it is reasonable to assume, and we have the best economic advice to this effect, that basic interest rates are about at the bottom. The Dominion Government is not likely to be able to borrow at very much below the interest rates it is now paying. In fact, the evil consequences of a further decline in interest levels might more than offset the assumed advantages. For instance, the solvency of billions of dollars of life insurance assets and liabilities in this country would be measurably affected by any further radical reduction in the basic rate of interest. I am not referring, of course, to the borrowers not yet able to take advantage of the very low rates which have been extended to the Dominion Government. What they are able to do depends less on what happens to interest rates than upon their own efforts and upon their policy in maintaining, in re-establishing and strengthening their own credit. Some of these days the tide of money rates is bound to turn. It always has in the past, it will again. That turn may come early, it may come late. When it does come, when the maturing bonds have to be paid off at higher rates of interest rather than lower rates, then we are going to feel a rapidly increasing weight of financial burden from the present large public debt. We can avoid that only if each government, each public borrowing body in Canada, will pursue a definite fixed programme of debt repayment. Debts have to be cleared off the books ultimately. Mr. Aberhart spoke the other day of converting Alberta's bonds into permanent debt. It is very difficult for me to imagine the basis of such a policy—why any man wants to go to the taxpayers and tell them that the policy of their province is to keep the burden of public debt on their shoulders forever, making no effort to repay. Our present population in Canada cannot continue to support the present burden of debt permanently, except at the cost of a reduced standard of living.

When a government borrows we know what happens. The citizens get the immediate advantage, of course, but ultimately some one must pay. It isn't a question of "human rights versus property rights," either when the money is borrowed or when it is due for repayment. If the debtor—a group of human beings—does not meet the debt, then the creditor—another group of human beings must meet the debt. Debts have to be paid ultimately and we should recognize that fact.

Our society is organized so much upon the basis of credit that debts ought to be treated with reasonable respect. A debt, as you know, is merely the complement of the credit. In public debts, as in private debts, the debtor should make a fair and honest effort to justify the trust imposed in it when it pledged its word and its faith, and the natural complement of a fair and honest attitude on the part of the borrower is a willingness on the part of the creditor to make an equitable settlement with a distressed but conscientious borrower.

Because of the significance of the burden of public debt, I want to suggest that in the programme of all public bodies in Canada for the next five years there should be a determination to stop piling up public debt in our present improvident manner. The elements in such a determination might reasonably be these:

First, to peg public debts at present levels.

Second, to cut out of spending programmes, for a definite period of years, all developments which do not give assurance of being completely self-supporting.

Third, to budget, not only for balanced revenues and expenses, but for a debt retiring surplus, sufficient, let us say, to retire present public debts over, approximately, the next generation.

In the attainment of these three objectives, the Loan Council plan of refinancing and control, so summarily dismissed by Alberta, could be a gallant and effective ally.

While I have no politics and this Club has no politics, I would like to pay my personal tribute to Mr. Dunning in presenting that plan to the Province of Alberta. It was a reasonable plan which would have solved the problem of Alberta had they been willing to accept it.

And the fourth point in a debt programme should be to increase the productive income of Canada, out of which debt charges must be paid, first, through immigration (which must ultimately be accepted as a national policy) and then through other policies designed to speed up the development of our natural resources by providing markets for the finished products made from them.

Unfortunately, we are up against this fact: that there is a curious thought, very widely prevalent, that the money that governments spend represents a net addition to wealth. Few people bother to wonder where governments do get the money they spend. I suppose if you ask the average man on the street he will say they take it out of the accumulated wealth of the idle rich or out of the earnings of the future, "the future" being a concept of somebody who is going to have plenty of money to look after his own needs and to pay the bills for what we spend today. A great many people think the money the government spends is simply created by putting the name of the Bank of Canada on the back of a piece of paper. Now these stupid notions will persist and the great mass of the people will continue to believe that the money the Dominion and provincial governments spend is of little concern to them until we can find a way to bring home to the people the very certain truth that they do pay these taxes.

There are more than 60 taxes wrapped up in every loaf of bread. How simple it would be to overthrow the mad demon of waste in government if everyone realized facts like that! Suppose each loaf of bread had to be delivered with 60 separate stickers, each one indicating the amount of the tax it represented and what the money was used for. There would be a white sticker labelled "Railway Deficit," and a red sticker labelled "Abattoir Losses," and a blue sticker labelled "Merchant Marine," and so on. If we could make people conscious of the truth that they pay the taxes we would make substantial progress toward the solution of our financial problems.

I must hasten on and come to the third major group of problems which is going to call for serious decisions in the next five years. They fall under the general heading of transportation.

The most obvious problem, the one we talk about most, is the surplus railway mileage and the heavy cost of maintaining it. The most patent evidence of the existence of that problem is the annual deficit of the Canadian National Railways. But even the losses of the C.N.R. represent but part of our larger transportation problem.

It is so difficult to get agreement in Canada on any measure designed to solve or alleviate in any way our railway problem. We all know from speeches we have heard from our bigwig politicians that they speak of the "political suicide" involved in any major effort at a solution. We have our political leaders competing publicly for the privilege of maintaining the integrity of the Canadian National Railways as a publicly-owned institution, when they could better devote their energies to maintaining the integrity of the taxpayers purse. (Applause) Unfortunately there is a tendency, which we must recognize, on the part of men highly placed in political parties in this country to say one thing in public about the railway problem and another in private. I recall one Cabinet Minister—I will not say, for obvious reasons, to which government he belonged—who said to me: "The only reason our railway policy is what it is and not what we know it ought to be is that we are terrorized by the railway vote."

Now, if craven fear is to influence our railway policies the problem is not going to be brought quickly to a solution, except through the pressure, ultimately, of an informed public opinion. There is no question in Canada which requires more courage in its solution than the railway problem but the courage should be there. We have never faced up to that problem. I don't think the Duff Report faced up to it courageously. I don't think the present Trustee Board have faced up courageously to the responsibility imposed upon them and certainly I go so far as to say I don't regard our present railway policies as an evidence of very much public courage.

There are other problems pressing on us, too, in regard to transportation. There is the problem of obsolescence. We have two of the finest railway systems in the world but the eningeering staffs of either of those railways could design roads and equipment that would be much more modern, more efficient and more economical. To modernize the railways, both as to lines and equipment, is going to cost us hundreds of millions of dollars in the next decade. How are we going to raise the money?

Likewise we are lagging behind in other forms of transport. More freight is carried by air in Canada than in any other country in the world, but it is almost all being carried in the pioneering fringe of the country. We have no transcontinental air mail, no transcontinental passenger service. We must have it, we must plan for it in the next five years or our commerce is going to lag behind and we are going to lose our position as the shortest link between Europe and the Orient.

Transportation is the amalgam of nationhood in Canada. Whether by land, water or air, it is so important a factor in our nation-building that the manner in which we answer its major challenges in the next five years will have a great influence on our future development.

There are a great many other problems I should like to have had time to discuss. I haven't referred to the desperate need for a simpler form of government, for a revision of our Constitution. I could enlarge upon immigration, land settlement, capital development. I could urge an independent and scientific study of the tariff and subsidy system in the hope we might end some of the bickering between different sections of the country in regard to tariffs, subsidies, and bonuses, but I have to leave these subjects to much more competent authorities than I am to discuss.

Whatever we do in Canada to blue-print and erect a bridge to our challenging but yet uncharted future, our decisions must be those of a Democracy, they must be decisions of representative government and the decisions must reflect the opinions of Democracy's masses. Therefore it is important that no opportunity be missed for honestly informing and moulding public opinion to first, an interest in and, second, an understanding of our basic problems. That is the splendid contribution a Club of this character does provide, an opportunity for discussion by people, usually independently minded, of our major national problems.

Everything I have said today presumes the continuance in Canada of faith in the democratic system and individualism as a way of life. If we depart from those concepts, then very little of what I have said will have any application to our problems in Canada. I trust that Canada is not prepared to accept a system of dictatorship or the concept of a totalitarian state, even when a dictatorship has the power to plan, to decide and to act. Dictatorship has won most of Europe and threatens to capture the largest remaining stronghold of Democracy on the Continent. If it does that, it will threaten the United States, it will threaten Great Britain and it will threaten Canada.

We may continue to argue about our problems, we may continue to temporize, to postpone the facing of realities. We may lull ourselves with fantastic doctrines of economic and social novelty. We may continue to do the wrong thing. That is one of the privileges of Democracy, but it is rather too generously exercised. It would be dangerous for us to presume too much upon that privilege, in the next five years. That is why I am glad to see these straws in the wind, this slight evidence that we are gradually beginning to face up to the major problems of the country. The next five years are going to see the battle lines drawn very closely between representative government and dictatorship through most of the world. The efficiency of those two types of government in achieving results will have a great deal to do with the world's final acceptance of one or the other form. All of us here in the room, we who believe in personal liberty under the democratic system, are presented with the challenge of demonstrating that our system, too, is capable of action—and of effective action. (Applause.)

MR. H. C. BOURLIER: Gentlemen: In his all too brief address, Mr. Chalmers has covered a great many very interesting points today, points that cannot be solved at once but which the people of this country are doing their best to deal with and in which we hope, from Mr. Chalmer's remarks, they may be ultimately successful. As far as the railway problem is concerned, if Mr. Chalmers will organize his government and make me his Minister of Transport, I will promise him we will arrive at some very pleasant solution within a very short space of time. We are not permitted though to debate those things from the Chair. I think, Mr. Chalmers, I am quite safe in saying we convey to you our most sincere thanks for a very interesting and instructive address.

THE GREATNESS OF THE GREAT LAKES

An Address by Mr. WILLIAM GANSON ROSE

Thursday, April 23rd, 1936

President: Our guest speaker today is a President of an advertising organization in Cleveland, Ohio. He has for years been active in civic matters in Cleveland. He is on the Chamber of Commerce, Emergency Relief Administration of Community Funds and other worthwhile activities have received his attention and support. During the World War he directed the United States Bureau of Expositions and the Red Cross Campaign in Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky. He is author of numerous books and magazine articles. Today, he comes to speak on a subject that should be of real interest to all of us—"The Greatness of the Great Lakes."

As I came into the room today I was reminded that it is St. George's Day and that I should be wearing a rose. Gentlemen, I brought the rose with me. He is at my right hand and I have much pleasure indeed, in introducing to you, Mr. William Ganson Rose. (Applause.)

Mr. William Ganson Rose: Mr. President, Members and Guests of the Empire Club of Canada and friends of the Radio Audience.

I bring to Toronto, the Cleveland of Canada, the greetings of Cleveland, the Toronto of the United States. (Applause.)

These greetings I bring not only from the city but, personally, from President Abram Garfield, Secretary Launcelot Packer and their associates of the English Speaking Union, from the British Commonwealth Club of Cleveland, from the Cleveland Branch of the Canadian Legion, from the British Empire League, made up of the Daughters of the British Empire, the Sons and Daughters of St. George, St. Andrew's Benevolent Society and all Scottish Organizations in the City. They extend hands across the Lakes to Toronto.

TORONTO

In miles of pleasant homes thy people dwell;
A hundred ships within thy harbour lie at ease;
Ten thousand chimneys high thy prowess tell;
Oh, mighty mart upon the land-locked seas!

It is embarrasing to be asked to discuss the greatness of the Great Lakes in a city that knows that greatness through close relationship.

However, I do not feel any more embarrassed than did the speaker in our Newburgh Insane Asylum. He had talked more than an hour when one of the inmates arose and walked from the hall. The speaker was embarrassed. "I hope I haven't offended anybody," he said. "Oh dear no," replied the superintendent, "you go right on talking; that fellow has been here twenty-five years and that's the first sign of intelligence he has shown."

(Laughter.)

No, I cannot tell you much that is new about the Great Lakes, but I can call to your minds some ideas you have had and possibly crystallize a few of them. In this connection, I call to mind the story of William Dean Howells and the farmer.

When Mr. Howells was Editor of the Jefferson Gazette in Ohio, he loaned a copy of Plato to a farmer. Sometime later the farmer returned the book. "Well, how did you like Plato?" asked Howells. "Fust rate," replied the farmer, "I see he's used some of my idears."

And so today, I hope you will find I am using some of your ideas.

"The greatest cities of the future will not be cities of Europe, nor Asia, nor India, nor will they be cities located on the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans." So spoke in 1930, Dr. J. Paul Good, outstanding student of natural resources. Then, he added, "the great cities of the future will be located on the Great Lakes."

If the Great Lakes have as great an influence as this, we should become better acquainted with them and learn in what ways we can capitalize upon the many advantages they offer.

Called "Great" because they constitute the largest body of fresh water in the world, their true greatness has a far broader significance. More than any other influence they have furthered the industrial and commercial development of the Dominion of Canada and the United States; their contribution to the ever higher standard of living of these countries is incalculable; their service to the territory bordering upon them has made this district the fastest growing industrial region in the world. The Great Lakes are indeed great!

I invite you to consider facts and figures concerning our inland waterways that should strengthen our faith in the future growth and prosperity of the Province of Ontario and of the States of the United States bordering upon the Great Lakes.

Now is the time to look forward—look forward to a future that promises achievements far surpassing any that have gone before—achievements largely made possible by our land-locked seas.

When La Salle sailed his cockleshell ship, "The Griffin," up the lakes in 1679, he little dreamed of the romance and the drama that would accompany the legion of boats to follow, from the canoes of the Indian tribes to the great steel ships that carry iron and coal and grain and lumber and stone and other commodities.

The commerce started by "The Griffin" has developed until the traffic on the Great Lakes is many times greater than that of the Suez Canal, where the trails of the world meet.

To the pioneers whose courage, resourcefulness, persistence and spiritual fervour overcame almost unsurmountable obstacles, we owe a debt of thanks, yes, of reverent appreciation.

La Salle's party saw Niagara Falls when making its famous journey in "The Griffin," and Father Hennepin, who served as historian for the group, gave the following description:

> "The water is so rapid above this descent that it violently hurls down the wild beasts endeavouring to pass. The waters do foam and boil after the most hideous manner imaginable, making an outrageous noise more terrible than that of thunder."

And so, Father Hennepin was Niagara Falls' first publicity man.

The Lake Cities saw the possibilities of lake transportation seventy-five years ago, but they never dreamed that the bulk cargo movement on the Great Lakes would some day reach the total of 150,000,000 tons. The year of 1936, it is predicted, will witness the largest movement on the Lakes since 1929, and this fact should contribute to better general business in the Lakes region.

What remarkable ships are those of today!

Compare one with the "Queen City" which broke the tonnage record in 1852 with 337 tons of iron, and, in a season of thirteen trips, carried 4500 tons, or one-third of what the "Harry Coulby" carries in a single trip.

Harry Coulby—a great name on the Great Lakes. As a poor immigrant boy from England, with a few dollars in his pocket, he asked in New York the way to Cleveland. "Out Broadway," was the answer, "and just keep on walking 600 miles." Harry Coulby did, and eventually walked into leadership among the men of the lakes.

Do you realize that a train of 285 cars, each containing 50 tons of coal, can be emptied into the hold of one of our modern vessels?

What progress has been made by fertile minds in the loading and unloading of the lake ships! One record was made by the "D. G. Kerr," which received its cargo of

12,508 tons in 16½ minutes. This same cargo was unloaded in three hours and five minutes.

It is interesting to note that the Province of Ontario, which forms the northern boundary of the Great Lakes, bears almost the same relationship to the Dominion of Canada that the Great Lakes States bear to the United States. The facts I will present, clearly indicate that the Great Lakes in both the Dominion and the United States have been the influence that has made the surrounding territory assume outstanding leadership for industry, commerce and general business progress.

The area of Canada is nearly equal to the area of the United States and its possessions, while the area of Ontario is nearly equal to that of the Great Lakes States. In fact, the Great Lakes States and the Province of Ontario each occupy 11 plus per cent of their respective nations, and each has an area more than four time the size of Great Britain and twice the size of France or Germany.

The Province of Ontario has more than three and one-half millions of the 10,800,000 people of Canada or 33 1/10 per cent of the total, while the population of the Great Lakes States is 35 per cent of the population of the United States and its possessions.

Let us consider for a moment how the lake cities have grown. Toronto has doubed in population every fifteen years since 1834, and greater Toronto before long will have a million people. In the Great Lakes States, since 1850 Chicago has jumped from 20th place in the Union to second, Detroit from 26th to fourth and Cleveland from 37th to sixth. Why?—largely because of the influence of the Great Lakes.

Our people in this territory appreciate that a city is not merely a place where houses are built and people exist, but a living, pulsing institution with heart and soul and character. We know that everyone can do something for the home town. I heard of an absolutely worthless vagabond who did the best he could do for Toronto—he moved to Buffalo.

Now let us see the industrial influence of the Great Lakes. The gross value of products made in Canada is a little more than two billion dollars; in Ontario fifty-one per cent of the total, or more than one billion dollars. One-ninth the territory, one-half the industry.

Now let us look across the lakes. In 1932, the United States manufactured products totalled in value $20,800,000,000, while the Great Lakes States products totalled in value $13,000,000,000, or 60% of the national production, reflecting the influence of the Lakes upon industry.

Ontario has become the automotive centre of Canada, the Great Lakes States the automotive centre of the United States. You lead Canada in the diversity of your manufacturing establishments; the Great Lakes States similarily lead the United States.

There is no need for exaggeration in describing these two rapidly growing territories. I wouldn't blame you for being suspicious as we across the Lakes are sometimes given to exaggeration; even the children have developed the habit.

A little boy near where I live started out as a prevaricator and he became a regular little liar. His father punished him, his mother washed his mouth with soap. Nothing seemed to do any good and one day the teacher called him to the platform before the school and said, "Willie, do you know what happened to Annanias and Saphira?" "Yes," said Willie, "God struck them dead for lying and I saw them carried into the drug store."

The Great Lakes serve much of the grain territory of Canada and the important grain producing States of the United States. The cheap transportation is largely responsible for the fact that 40% of your export trade is in agricultural products, and that the West and Northwest of the United States have been developed successfully in a short period of years. Reference to the volume of food products of this region reminds me of something Dr. Copeland, Senator from New York, told me. He said, "We live on one-third of what we eat; the doctors live on the other two-thirds."

Ontario is exporting its diversified products to all countries of the world and contributing largely to the fact that Canada, with less than 11,000,000 people, ranks fifth among the worlds' trading nations. The Great Lakes States similarly engage in export trade and are credited with nearly one-half the exports of their nation.

It was in Ontario that the telephone was invented by Alexander Graham Bell, so it is natural that you should use telephone service in amazing volume, and again, across the lakes, our Great Lakes States have 8,400,000 telephones, or one-half the total for the country.

You produce electricity economically and employ it effectively on your side of the lakes, for power, light and heat, while the Lake States use one-half the current produced in their country.

The railroad has played an important part in the development of the Great Lakes area. Yes, the iron horse and the steel boat have proved an invincible team. Your city is the focal point of the world's two largest railway systems and our Great Lakes States, in one-ninth the territory of the country, have one-third of the railway mileage.

Air transportation has grown rapidly in both countries since that first flight across the Atlantic from Newfoundland to Ireland in 1919, to my mind one of the most daring and inspiring adventures of all times, was made by those skilled and courageous aviators—Alcock and Brown.

Action is the keynote of this district. Huxley said the chief aim of life is not knowledge but action, or, as some wit has put it, "Footprints on the sands of time are not made by sitting down."

My audiences across the Lakes have found particularly interesting the Toronto Industrial Commission's study of the buying habits of your people, meaning their willingness to buy, as well as their progressivenes. For purposes of comparison the figures of passenger car registrations, radio sets, domestic telephones and wired homes have been used. In percentages, Ontario with 46 1/10 per cent nearly equals the other four market zones of the Dominion combined. To summarize these market comparisons, Ontario with 11 per cent of the area and 33 per cent of population of Canada has a income of more than 40 per cent, makes 40 per cent of the retail sales, 49 per cent of the industrial purchases, and in buying habits, with 46 1/10 per cent, stands far above the other Canadian markets.

Similarly, the Lake States lead their country in buying habits. With one-third the population, their retail trade is 55 per cent and their wholesale trade 56 per cent of the nation's.

Your mineral output is again increasing, and so is ours, but the Dominion has a great advantage over the United States in the volume and diversity of its minerals. Your mines are not like the definition of many of our mines. That definition is to the effect that a mine is a hole in the ground owned by a liar!

The people of the Province of Ontario and the Lakes States are entertainment-loving people. And here let me say that your choruses and bands are favourites in our Cities, and Cleveland looks forward each year to one of the most delightful treats of our entertainment season when the Toronto Skating Club presents its grace, rhythm and charm.

The tourist traffic between Canada and the United States is greater than that between any other two countries in the world. It is estimated that in 1934 the United States tourists spent in the Dominion more than $86,000,000 and should spend this year $100,000,000. Your tourists expend a substantial amount in the States.

But this traffic means far more than money. It means advertising your advantages, your playgrounds, your resources, your products; it means attracting investments; it means selling goods. Yes, and it means a first hand survey of the benefits that the Dominion can secure from the United States and the benefits the United States can secure from Canada, through the medium of our mutually owned Great Lakes. There are many ways in which we can capitalize upon each other's resources. We come to your mills for paper, as does much of the world, particularly that paper for daily newspapers, which reminds me of the definition I recently heard of a journalist. He is the man who knows where hell is going to break out next and sends someone to cover the spot.

We come to you for the valuable products of your farms and your seemingly limitless mines. We come to you for rest and recreation in your playgrounds that are unsurpassed on either hemisphere.

You come to us for iron and coal and industrial products, and so we are not only good neighbours, but mutually good customers.

Our teamwork is a habit, and the force of habit is a great power. I remember that Lord Dewar told of a retired dairyman who never looks at a pail of water without the irresistible desire to put some milk in it.

Your Canadian National Exhibition, the world's largest annual exposition, and your Royal Winter Fair make Toronto a popular meeting-place for many people on both sides of the Great Lakes. You are to be congratulated upon the high standard that is maintained for these important educational, entertaining and business building institutions. It is a pleasure to refer to your great Exhibitions in the talks we are giving in the Great Lakes States.

Cleveland is celebrating its one hundredth year since becoming a City. Appreciating what the inland seas have contributed to the City's growth and progress, it was natural that its celebration should take the form of a National Exposition dedicated to the Great Lakes—the Great Lakes Exposition.

It will be held in downtown Cleveland, on the lake shore, June 27th to October 4th, this year. Twenty million dollars worth of improvements are ready to serve the Exposition, and large buildings are being erected at this time, in the expectation of attracting five million visitors.

The Public Hall and Lakeside Exhibition Hall will be the scenes of government, state and city exhibits and of important gatherings.

The auditorium will be "Radio Land," where 15,000 people can watch the famous bands and orchestras and entertainers in their national broadcasts.

In the stadium, seating 80,000, will be held great athletic meets, prize drills, spectacles of stupendous size and other entertainments of impressiveness. "The Parade of the Years," in a special theatre, is the 1936 edition of the famous "Wings of a Century" at the Century of Progress Exposition, and a Lake Theatre will be the scene of popular concerts and aquatic events.

Electrical and other scientific displays will be found in the mammoth Hall of Progress nearly 600 feet long. Science, you know, is making wonderful strides. A Canadian newspaper observed that when science found it couldn't pry open the Pullman windows, it air-conditioned the trains.

A transportation building will tell the story of rail, lake, bus, air, and automotive transportation, and horticulture will have its building in a fairyland of flowers, with a garden 1,000 feet long to be given to the city. In the "Streets of the World," thirty-two nationalities will be in charge of more than a hundred buildings in a miniature Cosmopolitan City. Last evening the British Commonwealth Club of Cleveland, announced through its President, Harry Coopland, that here will be shown a replica of "The Old Curiosity Shop," immortalized by Charles Dickens, with its rare collection of old silver, pewter, glass and curios, faithfully reproduced.

Many special features are being added to the attractions each week. Among the latest is the famous "Byrd Ship," a large Submarine, a great car ferry that will be transformed into a Club House in the lake, and a two-acre living reproduction of the beauties and products of Florida.

I am asked by Mayor Burton and by the Exposition Officials to extend to you and to all the people of the Dominion a cordial invitation to attend. The Congress of the United States, which has authorized a large and comprehensive exhibit for the Exposition, yesterday requested the President of the United States to invite the Dominion of Canada to participate.

We believe that one of the fine achievements of the Great Lakes Exposition will be promoting acquaintance and strengthening goodwill between the Dominion and the United States. The project will impress the fact that the Province of Ontario and the eight Great Lakes States are neighbours, not separated by these inland seas but rather bound together in trade and relationship by these friendly waters.

The Province of Ontario and the Great Lakes States have weathered the depression and are apparently starting a new era of progress. Our full recovery, of course, depends upon world recovery. However, world recovery cannot be made upon a foundation of distrust. International confidence must again be established in Europe before peace and sound industrial relations are possible. Happily, the districts to the North and South of the Great Lakes are remarkable from the standpoint of being self-supporting, with food, power, machinery and the important minerals. Our people can live and advance with little outside aid. What either side of the lakes may lack, the other side provides. Here is a strong reason for developing our friendly relations.

Our business leaders in Ontario and the Lakes States, for the most part, are men who reckon time after the fashion of my old friend, John Kendrick Bangs, who said:

I do not count the time of day
As some do by the clock,
Nor by the tolling of a bell
Set on some steepled rock,
But by the progress that I make

In things I have to do;
It's either done-o'clock with me,
Or only half-past-through!

Let us who profit through the land-locked seas, develop our harbours for an ever-increasing traffic.

Let us join in cohesive action through our civic bodies to study international conditions affecting our Lakes region and make known the findings to our governments and citizens.

Let us use the Great Lakes for our mutual benefit and, over the friendliest borderline between any two nations, build goodwill and good business as a constructive example for the world.

We can do much through concentrated efforts.

Speaking of concentration, I call to mind Arnold Bennett's last visit to the United States when they gave him a large reception in Chicago. An effusive young woman of that City rushed up to him and said, "Mr. Bennett, I want to thank you for your wonderful books, but particulary for your article on "Concentration." Oh, it has done me ever so much good."

Mr. Bennett naturally was pleased, and he said, "May I ask upon what are you concentrating?"

"Oh," she replied effusively, "upon lots and lots and lots of things."

That, I fear, is the way that many are concentrating today.

A few years ago, I asked Thomas A. Edison why there are so few real leaders in the world today. He smiled and replied by pointing at a framed epigram by Sir Joshua Reynolds. It still hangs on the wall of the famous laboratory, and it reads: "There is no expedient to which a man will not resort to avoid the labour of thinking."

Or, as the humorist, Strickland Gillilan, puts it: "The district north of the human ears continues to be the greatest of all homes for the unemployed."

Ontario and the Lakes States are the homes of unsurpassed educational and cultural institutions, making for a citizenship of high character. And today constructive character is seriously needed in a world of distrust. Our neighbouring countries should imbue the business of this region with a true spiritual quality so that high ideals may be blended with commercial ambitions.

Due largely to the influence of the Great Lakes, Toronto has become an important industrial and commercial headquarters, but, more than that, an unsurpassed city of homes.

HOME

I heard a man from old New York
Express a thought this way:
"I've travelled all around the world
And now I want to say,
That while old London's mighty big,
And Paris leads in style,
And Canton, Cairo, Tokio,
Are all well worth the while,
I cannot find its equal, though
Through every land I roam;
New York is sure the best town—why?
It's home!"

I asked a man from Kankakee
To tell me if he could
What is the finest town on earth;
He smiled and said he would.
"I've never travelled anywhere,"
He told me with a wink,
"But that ain't any reason
Why a feller cannot think;
Though some folks like Chicagy, and
Others praise old Rome,
There ain't no place like Kankakee—
That's home!"

There's just a trifle of
A moral in this verse;
Let's have it clearly understood
And put it straight and terse.
When anybody asks you where
The best of towns can be,
The answer is an easy one,
As you will all agree;
Some towns are great, and yet you'll find
No matter where you roam,
Toronto is beyond compare—
It's home!

In concluding, may I express the hope that our sister cities may lengthen and strengthen the friendship that now exists.

Toronto and our Cleveland
A Lake between them rolls,
But space and tide can ne'er divide
Our kindred civic souls.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT: We owe to our guest speaker our very sincere thanks, particularly since two hours ago when I went up to his room, I found him with a Doctor on one side and a nurse holding his hand on the other. He dismissed not only the Doctor but also the nurse to come down and talk to us at this luncheon. I think Mr. Rose has given us a picture of the importance of that territory surrounding the Great Lakes, such as has not been presented to our minds before, and he has surely made a fascinating story of it.

To Mr. Rose and those who are with him in planning this Exposition in Cleveland, I know you will agree with me that we hope they have not five million but ten million at that Exposition because we know definitely, that most of the people that go there will also want to go up to see that Exposition on the banks of Lake Nipissing and in so doing we all know in travelling, the first day will be spent coming to Toronto and the second day going to Callander. We will see them all, and we will be glad they visited us. On your behalf I extend to Mr. Rose our very sincere appreciation for a most able address.

TO THE TOP OF THE WORLD WITH THE EASTERN ARCTIC PATROL

AN ADDRESS BY HONOURABLE W. G. MARTIN

Thursday, April 30th, 1936

MR. J. H. BRACE: In the summer of 1935, our guest speaker journeyed to Canada's farthest north as Historian with the Eastern Arctic Patrol. This would seem to be rather a chilly trip. However, I am given to understand that in the summer of 1934 he, and a number of friends, found Southern Canada a rather chilly place for the time being. (Laughter.) Probably as a result of his 1934 experience he was quite prepared to withstand the chills and the frigid temperature of our Arctic North.

The Honourable Mr. Martin needs no introduction to a Toronto audience. As Minister of Public Welfare in the late Government he had a great responsibility in the alleviating of the problems of the unemployed and in assisting the municipalities in distress. I think, as time goes on we, in Ontario, will more clearly understand the heavy load under which he carried on and under which the Honourable Mr. Croll today is carrying on.

Our guest speaker today will address us on the subject: "To the Top of the World with the Eastern Arctic Patrol." The Honourable Mr. Martin.

THE HONOURABLE W. G. MARTIN: Mr. President and Gentlemen: The experience we had last summer, I am glad the President noted, was somewhat of an anti-climax and I am very glad he also added the words 'for the time being.' Time moves very rapidly.

When the old "Nascopie" sailed down the St. Lawrence last July on her annual pilgrimage to Canada's farthest north, we had a very interesting company of people on board—officials of the Hudson's Bay Company, clerks and managers and apprentices; a detachment of the Canadian Mounted Police under the command of Superintendent Sandyswunsch; and the members of the Government Expedition.

As you well know, Canada has sent a number of expeditions into the far north. From 1913 to 1918, the leader of the expeditions was Mr. Stefansson, who talked of blonde Eskimos. Well, we saw some pale Eskimos, but no blondes. He also talked of living off the land. Then, following Mr. Stefansson, Major Burwash was the Commander and for the past three years, David Livingstone McKeand has led the Expedition.

The personnel of the Expedition included Mr. David Nichols, as geologist, Mr. Chas. Ney of the Department of Geodetic Survey of Canada, who was interested in the work of determining the latitude and longitude of ports en route; Mr. Brown, of the Federal Department of Agriculture, whom we regarded as the bugologist. It seems that every expedition that goes anywhere must have a man who goes around with a butterfly net. Mr. Brown brought back some very excellent specimens to be placed in the National Museum at Ottawa. Mr. Douglas Leechman, the archaeologist, and Commander Beard, who went to study the inlets and harbours to see what value they might have from a naval point of view.

Among the doctors was Dr. Richard of Ottawa, who was the physician for the expedition. When we went into Hudson Strait, Dr. Richard journeyed into Ungava Bay where they have not had a doctor for ten years. Dr. Birchard of Montreal who is head of the Department for the study of heart diseases at the Montreal General Hospital was with us until we reached Churchill and then his place was taken by Dr. Rabinowitch. As you know, Dr. Rabinowitch is head of the Department of Basal Metabolism of the Montreal General Hospital, and Director of the largest clinic for diabetes on the North American Continent. The work of Dr. Rabinowitch was to study the chemistry and physics of the Eskimo, also his diet. He exposed the Eskimo to certain kinds of food and watched the reaction upon the Eskimo by taking samples of his blood. He had a very fine equipment on board and during the months of the winter the work which he carried on has been followed up in the laboratories of McGill University.

One of the busiest men on board was the Postmaster, Mr. Melville MacLean, Supervisor of Postal Services for Canada. He visited the various post offices on the way. There was a time when if you desired to send a letter to Canada's far north, it would have to go to Peterhead in Scotland, come out on a whaler and when it reached northern latitudes the traders would come by dog team to the coast and go out in boats armed with potato sacks to take the letters ashore. Now, the government has established a number of post offices throughout the Eastern Arctic. The first one at which we called was Port Burwell at the entrance to Hudson Strait (I see they have put this map at the top of the world—it is rather difficult to reach.) Mr. MacLean found the total amount of postage business done by this post office in the previous fiscal year was 34 cents worth of stamps. I think there must have been some political pull in placing the post office in Port Burwell. The interesting thing that made Mr. MacLean a very busy man was the quantity of philatelic mail we carried. The fact that an expedition was going to Craig Harbour in Ellesmere Island, the most northerly post office in the British Empire attracted the attention of stamp collectors all over the world. Weeks before the expedition is due to sail Ottawa is actually swamped with requests and consignments of mail, properly addressed and covered with postage to pay for stamps and with requests that the letters be cancelled at the various ports of call. This year we carried with us 13,000 pieces of philatelic mail.

You will be interested, possibly, in the route we travelled. From Montreal we went down the St. Lawrence, through the Gulf, through the Straits of Belle Isle and up the Labrador Coast, stopping at Port Burwell; through the Hudson Strait, calling at Lake Harbour in South Baffin Land, and at Sugluk, Wakeham Bay and Wolstenholme down to Cape Smith in Hudson Bay—south to Port Harrison—then five hundred miles across Hudson Bay to Churchill; from Churchill to Chesterfield Inlet, on to Southampton Island, and Cape Dorset; across the Strait again to Lake Harbour, another call at Burwell, then 1300 miles due north to Craig Harbour in Ellesmere Island, within 750 miles of the North Pole. Having called at Devon Island and Pond Inlet, we came down again to Port Burwell, along the Labrador Coast; through the Straits of Belle Isle, and the Gulf, and ultimately arrived at Halifax. A cruise of 10,000 miles and we were never out of Canadian waters and every port was a Canadian port. (Applause.) It gives you some idea of the vastness of our great country. Some of those islands are very large. Baffin Land equals in size Great Britain, Ceylon, Tasmania and Newfoundland. Southampton Island is half the size of Ireland, and Devon Island is three-quarters the size of Ireland. Ellesmere Island is almost the size of Great Britain. It is the most northerly island. When we reached there the natives came to greet us. The total population of Ellesmere came—two mounties, two natives and their wives and three children.

The "Nascopie," of course, was a small vessel. I understand the "Queen Mary" which will make her maiden voyage in the month of May has a gross tonnage, and was weighed recently, of about 80,000 tons. The "Nascopie" has a tonnage of only 2,500 tons and yet the "Nascopie" can accomplish what the pride of the British Mercantile Marine, the "Queen Mary," can never hope to achieve, for the "Nascopie" is an ice breaker and her bow is so shaped that she can push through the ice, mount upon the ice floes and bear down upon them and by her own sheer weight crush them. Once she has opened up the lead she will follow it through. I don't think that was seen to better advantage than when we called at Craig Harbour. Early one morning we could see the copper hills of South Ellesmere Island. We could look through the glasses and see the two little shacks of the mounties, with the Union Jack floating above them. From nine in the morning until eight at night, the "Nascopie" pushed and shoved its way, inch by inch, yard by yard, steadily gaining the mastery until at last she was able to anchor within a few miles of Craig Harbour. During the whole day we had covered only six miles.

The "Nascopie," of course, is an old war vessel. During the War, the Hudson's Bay Company maintained an agency at Archangel and their ships carried ammunition to Russia and wheat and timber and so forth from Russia to France. The "Nascopie" was one of the vessels engaged in this work. In 1916 it was the "Nascopie" that piloted the way through the ice of the White Sea for the French cruiser bearing the French diplomats to their conference in Russia. In 1917 she was attacked by a submarine but the second shell from the "Nascopie's" guns caused a terrific explosion aboard the submarine and it was never heard of again, and for that the "Nascopie" received the bounty of the Government and the thanks of the British Admiralty.

We were so crowded with equipment that we did not have much room for exercise and I was interested in the fact that in the early days of exploration they had dumb bells on board for daily exercise. We had no dumb bells—I mean not the sort you use with your hands. They also carried barrel organs which would grind out country dances for the members of the expeditions to dance to during the long days and nights of winter. We had no barrel organ and we didn't have a radio. We were cut off from civilization save for the few days that we were in Churchill waiting for our coal to be brought out from Newcastle to take us to our far northern point, but we had a gramophone and morning, noon and night, that gramophone ground out sentimental ditties about Sunny Texas and some pathetic little ballad about the Isle of Capri.

One thing that did interest us was the splendid library dealing with the immortal achievements of those indomitable adventurers of the far north whose supreme purpose was to reach Asia by sailing westward over a northern route. And, if you turn back the pages of your history you will remember there were three routes under consideration—the route over the North Pole on the far side of Greenland between Greenland and Spitzbergen. Then there was the northeast passage which was vainly attempted by Henry Hudson. Thirdly, the northwest passage. The northwest passage divided itself into two routes—through the Davis Strait, discovered by John Davis, intrepid British explorer in 1587, or through Hudson Strait; and once through the Strait there were two possible routes: north through the Fox Channel or across Hudson Bay to a possible opening on the west side.

One of the most intrepid explorers in British history was William Baffin. In the year 1609 the North West Company sent Baffin out to find the northwest passage. He crossed the ocean, went up on the west side of Greenland to the top of Baffin Bay. When he got to the top of that huge bay he was blocked by the ice so he turned south until he came to Lancaster Sound. At Lancaster Sound he saw the Inlet, but he also saw the range of ice-clad mountains and thinking it was an impassable barrier he came out and went home.

Now, the interesting fact is that not for 200 years,—not until England had fought her civil wars, lost her colonies to America, and shipped Napoleon to St. Helena, did any British ship venture into the north again. When Britain had won the battle of Trafalgar and had certainly established her position as Mistress of the Seas, she thought of other worlds to conquer and she dreamed of the north. She followed her dreams with ships and in 1818 the British Admiralty sent out an expedition of four ships, two to go up the east side of Greenland, crossing the pole, and the other two to go up through Davis Strait, where Baffin went two centuries before, and they were to meet on the other side of the world. The ships that went into Davis Strait were under the command of Ross. He, too, was blocked by the ice and turned south just as Baffin did. He felt that he couldn't get through Lancaster Sound and so went home again.

All the hydrographic and meteorological surveys carried on by Ross on that expedition meant nothing. The nation that had sent the little corporal into exile would brook no failure, so Ross was shelved, but his second in command was Captain Parry. Parry felt that they never should have gone home so Parry was sent out. He carried provisions for three years and among the provisions were pickles and sauer kraut and vinegar, antiscorbutics, and when I came to that page in history—and we had lots of time to read during the three months—I realized why on the "Nascopie" we had a very generous supply of lime juice which we drank, morning, noon and night, as something which would prevent us suffering from the disease of scurvy.

Parry made three expeditions in which he carried the flag of his nation half way around the world. In 1824 Ross was given another commission and with him went his nephew, and it was the younger Ross that discovered the north Magnetic Pole. One day he noticed his compass dip to 89 degrees and 59 minutes. He had made a great discovery. He erected a cairn of stones but he wished that nature had left a mark, mighty as Sinbad's fabled mountain, to denote the place of one of her dark powers. The goal of Ross was King William's Island. But it was the starting point of Sir John Franklin, I presume the greatest explorer of all time. You will remember that Sir John Franklin's first expedition was over land. He came out to New York and journeyed to what is today Toronto and in this wonderful city he was entertained by the Governor, Sir John Colborne. Following the reception he went up Yonge Street to Newmarket and Holland Landing, Severn and on to Georgian Bay. Then natives took him by canoe across the water to the Soo to Fort William and Fort Garry and followed the prairie system of rivers and lakes until one day he saw the waters of the Arctic Ocean.

Going back to England he was knighted for his achievement and made Governor of Van Dieman's Land—this diplomatic appointment rather bored a man of the temperament of Sir John Franklin.

Some years later the British Government decided to send another expedition to conquer this great empire of the far north and Franklin offered his services. They said to him, "Sir John, you are too old. You are fifty-nine years of age," but when he persisted they appointed this ageing but experienced Saint George to go and do battle against the mighty dragon of the north and in July of 1845 the "Terror" and the "Erebus" went forth. A few weeks later a whaler saw a ship moored to an iceberg off the Greenland Coast; it was one of the ships of the Franklin Expedition. It was the last time they were seen by civilized man and the historian has written the closing chapter very vividly when he says: "Fitz James was the second in command. After the death of his last remaining companion, Fitz James was all alone in a terrible world. Gazing around him in mute despair, the sole living thing in a frozen universe. The setting sun looks back to see the last wretched victim die. He meets her sinister gaze with a steady eye as if bidding her defiance. For a few minutes they glare at each other, then the curtain is drawn and all is dark."

Well, Gentlemen, when I walked in and out of our wireless cabin I would say to myself, "What a pity it is that they didn't have such things in Franklin's day! If they had, a message could have been winged through space and ice-breakers like the "Nascopie" could have ploughed through the ice field to rescue them, but because they lacked these wonders of modern scientific invention a precious bit of humanity was allowed to perish in the unknown.

As we journeyed north and watched all the activity of the unloading of freight and all the business of the various ports, the question came, "Why all this? Why send expeditions? Why have mounties in the north, and Hudson's Bay men?" And the answer is just one word, "Fur." The great industry of the north is the fur industry. In fact it has been well said that the beaver is the empire builder of Canada.

You remember that in 1497 Cabot came out from England and planted the cross of St. George on Cape Breton Island and when he went back again he told of these fishing banks of the "new found land" where the fish were so plentiful that they didn't catch them in nets, they caught them in baskets? This was very important news to Catholic Europe with their many meatless days, so in a short space of time many ships from France and other parts of Europe were going out to the new found land. When England turned Protestant and substituted roast beef for fish, England was no longer interested in the fishing banks. In fact, some one has said the Reformation shook the fish business to its very foundations.

In 1603 there were hundreds of French fishing boats off the Newfoundland Coast and it became apparent, if these lands of the new world were to be colonized, they would be colonized by the French and not by the British. The fishermen caught the fish, placed them on the drying platforms and cut them open with the impressive fish knives. The Indians who came noticed the knives and said to themselves, "If we only had some of these knives it would give up power and prestige in the tribe." So they went away and came back with fur and the best fur they had was the beaver and so they exchanged a beaver skin for a fisherman's knife, and thus there came to birth a system of barter which has continued down through the centuries.

Away up in the far north there are no beavers and no Indians. The fur is the white fox. The natives, the Eskimos, bring in harvests of furs which are baled and brought out and sent to Beaver House, London, England, headquarters of the Hudson's Bay Company. When they bring their furs to the post the Hudson's Bay Manager says: "that skin is worth five, ten or fifteen beaver." The beaver is the unit of currency and the trader gives the Eskimo a little metal coin with the figures five, ten or fifteen stamped on it. With this token the natives go to the Hudson's Bay Company and secure clothing, ammunition, food and so forth.

Soon it became evident in the early days that if France was to colonize the land of the St. Lawrence and the region of Acadia, it wouldn't be for the sake of fish, it would be for the sake of fur.

You remember how Dryden puts it:

"Friend once twas fame that sent thee forth
To brave the tropic heat, the frozen north,
Late, it was gold then beauty was the spur,
But now, our gallants venture forth for fur."

But something happened that changed the course of history in the new world. The victory of Wolfe put an end to the dream of a French Empire in America; and the organization of the Hudson's Bay Company proved disastrous to the activities of the company of New France which had a monopoly of the fur business. Yet, it is interesting to note that two Frenchmen had much to do with the organization of the Hudson's Bay Company—Radisson and Sieur de Groseilliers. The English people couldn't pronounce Radisson and Groseilliers, so they called them Radishes and Gooseberry. These two men went to the head of the Great Lakes in the region of Lake Superior, traded with the Indians for furs. For this illicit trading they were fined $10,000. They went back to their native France and sought restitution, but in vain. They crossed the Channel to England and sought the influence of the court of Charles but without success. Fortunately they contacted Prince Rupert who listened to their story and interceded in their behalf with the King, and the next year two ships went out under the command of these two men. When they came to Hudson Strait, Radisson lost heart and turned back. Groseilliers went through the Strait down to the southern end of Hudson Bay to what is now James Bay and there built a palisaded fort and named it after King Charles. The next year he returned to England with a shipload of furs.

Then it was easy to get the charter—and what a charter it was! It was written on the skins of animals; and it gave to the Company the sole commerce of all those seas, straits and bays, rivers, lakes, creeks and sounds; with fishing of all sorts and all mines of gold, silver, gems and precious stones discovered and undiscovered and made them absolute lords and proprietors of all the seas and lakes and streams etc. in the Hudson Bay and straits thereof, and so forth.

So it was that York Factory became the great fur capital of the north. The Hudson's Bay Company sent out their first outfit and it contained "two hundred fowling-pieces, powder and shot, two hundred brass kettles, twelve gross of knives and a thousand hatchets." This is the interesting thing: When we went north, every box, bag and crate was marked: "Outfit Number 266," indicating that for two and three-quarter centuries, the Hudson's Bay Company has never failed to send outfits into the north to trade with the natives and bring back a harvest of furs.

This year on the "Nascopie" we had everything from needles to motor boats. When I saw the motor boats being loaded and handed to the Eskimos, I said, "Do you mean to tell me that an Eskimo can afford a motor boat?" and they repiled, "Don't you understand that sometimes they have $1,500 worth of credit in a single year. They don't allow anything to stay on the books. They take everything that is coming to them, not because they distrust the Hudson's Bay Company, for the words, 'Pro Pelle Cutem' are on the coat of arms of the Hudson's Bay Company, 'the skin for the fur,' and in the estimation of the Eskimo, that represents a square deal."

More important than the lands we visited were the people, and, of course, all the natives of the Eastern Arctic are Eskimos. It is an Indian word. The Indians despised the Eskimo, so they called them Eskimos — "eaters of raw flesh" — but the Eskimo calls himself "Innuit." Last year in his Silver Jubilee Celebration, His Late Majesty, King George, sent a message to his loyal and beloved Innuit. There is no doubt they came from Asia across the Bering Sea. There is nothing at all in their manner of life, appearance or makeup or habits or general philosophy of life to indicate any solitary kinship between the Eskimo and the Indian. They are as far apart as the poles are asunder. The Eskimo crossed from Asia with his stone implements, his bow and arrow, his skin clothing and the skin boots. By the way, when the skin boots which the mounties, traders and natives wear get wet, they become hard as flint, then it is the work of the Eskimo women to chew them soft again and the women's teeth are worn right down to the gums as a result of the persistent chewing of the seal skin.

The features of the Eskimos, their high cheek bones, black eyes, sleek black hair, their picture writing, their hieroglyphics seem very much like the writing of the Egyptians, their implements and weapons all indicate and prove conclusively the Mongolian origin of the Eskimo. There are 33,000 of them in the world, most of them in Alaska and Greenland, but 7,000 are living in the Eastern Arctic.

The Eskimos are hunters and in summer live in skin tents. In the winter, when hunting, they reside in igloos. It has been said that they don't use the igloos any more.

They do and the mounties use them, for when the mountie is on patrol he has no shelter but the igloos. The natives take their harpoons and find where there is depth and there cut out the blocks of frozen snow. They build in a circle and bevel the edges of the blocks so that the igloo is shaped like a bee-hive. It takes about sixty minutes to build a snow house. They don't use an old snow house if they pass that way again. An old snow house is cold and clammy and a new one is so delightfully comfortable and warm. One half of the floor is raised to form a platform and then they put down skins. The mounties tell me that in their sleeping bags they are quite comfortable and in a very few minutes are sound asleep.

The thing that impressed me with regard to the Eskimo was his very high standard of culture, and his ingenuity in adapting the things about him to provide the means whereby to live. For instance, he goes out in his sealskin boat to hunt the seals in order to get the skins to construct the skin boats to go and hunt the seals. His clothes are of sealskin. He uses the walrus blubber as meat for his dogs, and seal oil for his stone lamp. He uses the tusks of the walrus for the end of his harpoon with which to go out and hunt some more walrus. They have on the end of the harpoon a flint tip and when they throw it, it penetrates the back of the mammal. The harpoon floats away and the native goes up with a spear and finishes the job and then goes out and retrieves his harpoon.

Of course, they are eaters of raw flesh. I don't see anything very objectionable to that, when you see them doing it—not any more than they would think of us were they to see us eating watermelon. They carve the salmon trout in cutlets and eat it as we eat our watermelon, and throw the skin away. It has been said that they are not very clean in their habits. I saw one little fellow when he had finished eating the fish—he threw the skin away, went down and washed his hands, cupped the water in his hand and leaned over and washed off his mouth, wiped off his hands on a rock and leaned over again and wiped off his mouth, using the same rock for a towel.

What about their general life, their religious life? I noticed in the paper yesterday morning that Bishop Turquetil had received the Legion of Honour from France for the great work he had done in the Eastern Arctic in his diocese of 1,500,000 square miles. The Anglicans are doing a great work under the leadership of Bishop Fleming.

General health conditions—how about that? It is only when a doctor comes on the "Nascopie" that many of the people have any medical attention. If I were to draw a circle, starting north of Cartwright, going up to the top of the world and completing a circle, containing millions of square miles of territory, I would indicate an area where there are only two doctors, one at Pangnirtung and the other at Chesterfield Inlet.

The general health of natives and also of the mounties and the Hudson's Bay men is generally good. Sometimes disease is aggravated by neglect. There was a case of a little Eskimo fellow ten years of age. Dr. Rabinowitch examined him and his foot was black with gangrene from the ankle down. His temperature was 104 degrees and the doctor was sure that he was going to die. He tried to give him an anaesthetic but without success. I took a chocolate bar and broke it into little pieces and put bits of the chocolate on the tongue of the little fellow while Dr. Rabinowitch lanced the wound. To get at the wound, the doctor had to cut right down to the bone. I never saw such courage as displayed by that little fellow. At three in the afternoon when the doctor went back again his temperature had gone down to nearly normal and the boy had a splendid chance of recovery. The tragedy of it was that we sailed away that night and not until the expedition arrives next year will it be known whether he recovered or not.

At Pond's Inlet we saw an old man who had had trouble with his foot. He was sixty-five years of age.

Last year his foot had been frozen and in the Spring it was not doing well. One day he found a rusty hack saw and cut the foot off at the instep, taking out the diseased bones. We saw the bones on a shelf inside his tent. The wound had healed, it was just a little red and inflamed in one place, and with a chuckle the old fellow put on his sock and went out to help in the unloading of the freight.

One place a little further south the doctor went to a tent and came hurrying out to say that a little babe would be born in a few hours. Later in the day when the doctor came on board the ship he said, "It's a girl." As we sailed away Bishop Fleming called over the side of the ship to the missionary of the post. "When the baby is baptized give it, as one of its Christian names, "Rab." This was in honour of Dr. Rabinowitch for it was the first time in the history of the whole of Baffin Land that a doctor was present at the birth of a child.

Now, a word about the dogs. I could have brought home a little husky pup but I knew what he would grow to be. The dogs are very fearsome brutes. They are good servants but everything crawling upon the ground belongs to the husky. When you walk along the slippery rocks, beware you do not slip and fall. Carry a rock so the dog will be warned against your action. Four or five years ago the wife of one of the mounties was carrying titbits to the dogs which she had brought up from puppyhood. She tripped on a rock and before help came the dogs had torn and frightfully mauled her. The mounties and natives use a thirty foot whip which they crack on the flanks of the team which is spread out fan shape. But they are marvellous animals. Everywhere the mountie and the missionary go depends on the quantity of dog meat available, and those dogs will carry 1,000 pounds of freight one hundred miles in 24 hours over the hummocky ice.

No message is complete without a reference to the mounties. The mounties' reputation for fearless determination in the cause of justice is admired throughout the whole world, but up in the north he is a man of parts. He has to be doctor and surgeon, nurse and tax collector, sheriff and customs officer and coroner. No human activity is beyond him. He raises dogs, he washes and cooks and builds houses, but over and above everything else his supreme consideration is the maintenance of law and order and the great slogan of the north country is, "When in trouble go and tell the police."

Our most northerly point was Craig Harbour and while we sit here this afternoon there are two mounties there —Paddy Hamilton and Grant McWhirter, and by the way, McWhirter is a first cousin of the speaker you had here on your Kipling Day—Dr. George Pidgeon, of this city. When we said goodbye that September night and saw them go away in their motor boat we knew it was their last contact with civilization until the ship returned next September. In that lonely outpost like others of the Force in other places, they stand guard for Canada. Half way down Baffin Land we saw a young King's Scout—a Hudson's Bay manager, living alone at his post, without contact with any other white men the year round. He thought he could sketch; he had no pigments—but he had some house paint: he had no canvas but he had some biscuit boxes: He had no brush but he pulled out some of his strong black hair and made brushes and he painted a picture which he sent down last year to the National Gallery. Of course, it doesn't hang there but this last year the National Gallery of Canada sent, as their gift to young Knapp, King's Scout, manager of the Hudson's Bay Company, some canvasses and a set of paints and brushes. (Applause.)

Gentlemen, it is to such as these, traders, doctors, missionaries, mounties that the vast continent of the far north proffers her hand when she says:

Send me men, girt for the combat,
Send me men that are grit to the core,
Give me the best of your breeding,

Lend me your chosen ones
Them will I take to my bosom,
Them will I call my sons,
But I will not be won by weaklings,
Subtle, suave, mild,
But by men with hearts of Vikings
And the simple faith of a child.

(Applause.)

Mr. Brace: Gentlemen, we have come to the close of another year in the history of The Empire Club of Canada. I wish to extend my personal thanks and appreciation for the co-operation that has been extended to me by the members of the Club, by the Executive and by the officers.

Shortly, I am going to call upon our President-Elect, Major Gordon B. Balfour, K.C. who has two brief and important announcements to make to you.

I am sure I am expressing a feeling of gratitude from all of you when I say how much we appreciate the address which the Honourable W. G. Martin has just given to us. (Applause.) Too many of us, I think, have learned our geography from Bay Street and we have looked upon Northern Canada as that zone where there is supposed to be at times, gold, silver and other precious metals found. Today, we learn again that that part of our territory is in Southern Canada and when we want to think of the northern zone we have to think of the fur zone. I think we have had today an address which brings back many of those things that we thought of in our youth and that we have forgotten. It brings to us the expanse of this great country of ours such as we have not realized in many years and on your behalf I extend to Mr. Martin our very sincere thanks. (Applause.)

I will ask Major Balfour now to present the subject that he has for you.

Major Gordon B. Balfour, K.C.: Gentlemen: In view of the statements appearing in the press during the past week regarding the possibility of amalgamation of the Empire Club of Canada and the Toronto Branch of the Canadian Club, it is necessary for me to make some statement to define our position.

Colonel Bishop, the retiring President of the Canadian Club, as he himself explained, was merely referring to personal conversations with individual members of the committee and no official representation has at any time been made to the Empire Club, so that there is nothing before us to consider.

No doubt unintentionally, the impression was created that the Empire Club was formed by discontented members of the Canadian Club. I believe that this impression should be corrected without delay.

The Empire Club of Canada was formed in 1903 by a group of men who thought there was some necessity for emphasizing in every possible way the part that Canada plays in a United Empire and it was for that reason that the Club was formed and it was because of that, that the Club was given its name.

Speaking only for myself, I suggest that there has been no time when there was a greater need for emphasis on our relationship to the Empire than at the present time, (Applause) and in my opinion, if no club having the ideals of the Empire Club existed today, there would be reason to organize such a Club as we now have for the very purpose for which it was originally created.

Our associations with the Canadian Club have always been most friendly and we believe that they are serving a very great purpose, in many respects similar to that of our own Club, but we believe that we are fulfilling a function which it would be most unwise in any way to restrict.

Should a practical scheme be devised to provide for an amalgamation which would be consistent with the name and ideals of this Club, it would, of course, receive serious consideration.

In case there may be any doubt in the minds of the members, I may say that no official action has been taken, nor is there any intention on the part of the officials of this Club to take any action without full regard to the principles of this Club which has established such a proud position in Canada. (Applause.)

We have to be proud of the Empire Club in another respect, and this is my second statement, and that is the position it now occupies financially.

At our Annual Meeting, when the business of the Club is transacted, we have in the past adopted a policy of not giving the financial statement to the members but have referred them to the Year Book when published. It has been convenient for the past few years to have it done in that way, but I think this year the members ought to be apprised of the fact that we have, for the first time since the disastrous loss of the surplus through the failure of the Home Bank, a substantial surplus, and our finances are in such good shape that we have provided for all the outstanding contingencies, including the very expensive publication of the Year Book, and yet we have a substantial surplus. (Applause.)

Now, it is very gratifying for us to be in this enviable position and I think that I am correct in stating that we as members of the Empire Club of Canada owe this almost entirely to the efforts of one man. That is our Honorary Secretary, Mr. Hubert F. Powell. (Applause.)

It is now going to be my great pleasure to make a small presentation to Mr. Powell, as a token of our appreciation. Will Mr. Powell approach the Head Table, please?

. . . Mr. Powell presented with a silver tray and tea service . . .

In presenting you with this silver service, I can't do better than read what has been inscribed upon it and which will make it a valuable antique for future generations:

"To Hubert F. Powell, Esquire,
Honorary Secretary of The Empire Club of Canada:

Presented at a General Meeting of the members on the 30th of April, 1936, in recognition of his efficient and faithful services in the interests of the Club.

Mr. Powell, I am sure the members of the Club would like to hear you express your appreciation.

MR. H. F. POWELL: Mr. Chairman and members of the Empire Club: You could knock me over with a feather. I am rather embarrassed at this great surprise, but I will say that in the past two years if I have helped and assisted in the Club, it has been quite a pleasure to me and an enjoyable one.

This presentation here before me is too beautiful for words. About all I can say, now is that I thank you all from the bottom of my heart for this beautiful gift. (Applause.)

ANNUAL MEETING

The Annual Meeting of The Empire Club was held, immediately preceding the address of the guest speaker on Thursday, April 9th, 1936. The President, Mr. J. H. Brace, was in the Chair.

Moved by Mr. Howard Webster,
Seconded by Mr. H. C. Bourlier,
THAT the interim Financial Report be accepted.
CARRIED.

President Brace: I will ask Mr. Arthur Hewitt to present the report of the Nominating Committee.

The Report of the Nominating Committee was presented, as follows:

Immediate Past President	J. H. Brace
President	Major Gordon B. Balfour, K.C.
1st Vice-President	R. M. Harcourt
2nd Vice-President	W. M. Hargraft
3rd Vice-President	J. D. Cameron
Hon. Treasurer	Howard Webster
Hon. Secretary	H. F. Powell
Executive	J. S. P. Armstrong
	H. C. Bourlier
	F. L. Clouse
	G. D. Davis
	A. B. Fisher
	G. C. Francis
	F. B. Fetherstonaugh, K.C.
	Gerald Jephcott
	Lawrence Junkin
	Rev. Dr. R. B. McElheran
	F. B. Matthews
	Wills MacLachlan
	J. B. Pratt, K.C.
	B. K. Sandwell

E. F. Thompson
Canon H. F. D. Woodcock
Horace Harpham
Past Presidents ......Colonel George A. Drew
J. D. Spence, K.C.
H. G. Stapells

Moved by Mr. Arthur Hewitt,
Seconded by Mr. Geo. C. Gale,
THAT the Report of the Nominating Committee be accepted.

CARRIED.

President Brace: We are approaching the closing of another year in the activities of this Club. Any success which we have had during the past year has been a result of the efforts of the officers and the Executive who have worked very hard in behind the scenes. I would like to express publicly my sincere thanks for the assistance that all of these gentlemen have given to me.

During the past year the Empire has been bereaved through the loss of our late King, George the Fifth. Your Club sent its condolences to the Royal family through the Governor-General of Canada and we have received the following message in reply:

Buckingham Palace,
February 13, 1936.

I am commanded to convey to the members of The Empire Club of Canada the sincere and heartfelt thanks of the King and the members of the Royal family for the kind message of sympathy in their great loss contained in your letter of January 22nd.

(Signed) Wigram.

The Empire, also, during the past season has lost its great poet and author, Rudyard Kipling. It is therefore very fitting that today be set aside to review this great man and his work. He was a true Imperialist.

The Club has lost during the past year, three of its Honorary Presidents—Dr. D. J. Goggin, Captain James B. Perry and Colonel Alex. Fraser. Other members of the Club also have passed from our midst. We extend our very deepest sympathy to the bereaved families.

His Excellency, Lord Tweedsmuir, Governor-General of Canada, shortly after his arrival in Canada, graciously accepted the office of Honorary President of this Club. We feel distinctly honoured in having him accept this position in our organization.

You have heard the Interim Report of our Honorary Treasurer. I am sure you are all pleased with the financial position of our organization. Once again, our thanks are due to Mr. H. F. Powell who has so diligently carried on as Honorary Secretary of the Club. (Applause.) I feel that all appreciate, as I do, his interest in this Club in accepting once again the office of Honorary Secretary. I asked him to sit at the head table where you would all have an opportunity of seeing him, but as usual, he was very modest, and he is at the further corner of the room, but I am going to ask Mr. Powell to stand. (Applause.)

The officers and members of the Club whom you have just elected will, I am sure, carry on the high traditions of this Club and I look forward in this, the ensuing year, to a year of progress and a year of great success.

There are nine new members of the Executive for the coming year: F. L. Clouse, A. B. Fisher, G. C. Francis, Horace Harpham, Gerald Jephcott, Lawrence Junkin, Wills MacLachlan, Rev. Dr. R. B. McElheran and Canon H. F. D. Woodcock. I welcome them to office and I am confident, with their assistance that great work will be done by this Club next year. I would like the gentlemen to stand so we may all have a look at them. (New officers stood.) (Applause.)

Your incoming President, Major Gordon Balfour, will, I feel sure, carry on with dignity in the office of President of this Club. (Applause.) He needs no introduction to the members of this organization. I think you would all like to have him come to the microphone and acknowledge the honour you have conferred upon him, and just to say a few words to us at this time. (Applause.)

MAJOR GORDON B. BALFOUR, K.C.: Mr. President, Fellow-Members of The Empire Club: I appreciate very much the honour you have conferred on me in electing me President of this Club. I appreciate also, and want to thank you for the very fine, strong Executive Committee which you have elected to support me in the work of the year before this Club. I take issue to a certain extent with our still-President, in regard to the responsibility for the success of the Club, however, and I would like to verify or rather add to it by saying that every member of the Club contributes, and I expect in my term at least, to have every member of the Club contribute to the success of this Club by, for instance, bringing prospective members or guests to the meetings, by regular attendance to hear the speakers and to associate with others who may be at the table or in the room, and finally, by making suggestions to me or to any of the Executive, regarding the operations of the Club, prospective speakers the quality of the luncheons, and the types of addresses you should have. I am sure the co-operation of the individual members of the Club will be very welcome and I think as far as I am concerned, I will depend to a great extent upon that co-operation.

The Empire Club in this particular year has perhaps a greater function, a greater duty than ordinarily. The spirit of the British Empire was never so much needed in Canada, never so much needed in the whole civilized world as it is today. The King we are fortunate enough to have recently accede to the throne, King Edward the Eighth, is a King who is more than just a King of England. He is also King of Canada. He is known throughout the world and is affectionately, very affectionately regarded by the great Republic to the south of us. In fact, when they mention his name, they say 'The King.' It isn't, 'The King of England,' it is 'The King.'

As far as The Empire Club is concerned, I shall try with your assistance, with the assistance of all the members, to have interesting and instructive speakers, speakers who will as far as consistent with other things, deal with the Empire and its duty to the world, as it is in this day.

I look forward to a successful year, of course. I am not accepting the honour of the Presidency without fully recognizing the responsibility entailed but I do say, and say again, I bespeak the co-operation, not only of the Executive, but of every member of The Empire Club, to further the interests of the Club and make it the successful organization it has been in the past. Thank you.

(Applause.)

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30TH APRIL, 1936

Receipts

Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1935	$ 743.59	
Fees Received	4,118.00	
Bank Interest	30.75	
Sale of Year Books	12.00	
Sale of Luncheon Tickets	262.00	
		$5,166.34

Payments

General Expenses:		
Postage, Printing and Stationery	$1,867.50	
Telegrams and Telephone	163.51	
Fees and Expenses of Speakers	474.15	
Recording and Publicity	435.75	
Luncheon Expenses	534.25	
Presentation	222.00	
Miscellaneous Expense	73.00	
		3,770.16
Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1936		$1,396.18

We have audited the books and accounts of the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario for the year ended 30th April, 1936 and certify that the foregoing statement of Receipts and Payments is correct according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us and as shown by the books of the Club for the year ended 30th April, 1936.

H. T. JAMIESON, & COMPANY,
Chartered Accountants.
Auditors.

Toronto, Ontario.
16th May, 1936.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

PAST HONORARY PRESIDENTS:

1903-1912	Rt. Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L.*
1913-1926	Field Marshal H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught and Strathearn, K.G., G.C.M.G.
1927-1931	Rt. Hon. Viscount Willingdon, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G.
1931-1935	Rt. Hon. The Earl of Bessborough, P.G., G.C.M.G.

PAST PRESIDENTS:

1902-05	Brig.-Gen. James Mason.*
1905-06	Rev. William Clark, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.*
1906-07	J. P. Murray, Esq.*
1907-08	J. F. M. Stewart, Esq., B.A.
1908-09	D. J. Goggin, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.*
1909-10	Elias Clouse, Esq., M.D.
1910-11	J. Castell Hopkins, Esq., F.S.S.*
1911-12	F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, Esq., K.C.
1912-13	Rt. Rev. James F. Sweeney, M.A., D.D., D.C.L.
1913-14	Mr. Justice James Craig.*
1914-15	Lt.-Col. R. J. Stuart.
1915-16	Albert Ham, Esq., Mus. Doc.
1916-17	James Black Perry, Esq.*
1917-18	Norman Sommerville, Esq., M.A., K.C.
1918	F. J. Coombs, Esq.
1919	R. A. Stapells, Esq.
1920	Arthur Hewitt, Esq.
1921	Brig.-Gen. C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., LL.D.
1922	Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
1923	Ellis H. Wilkinson, Esq.
1924	William Brooks, Esq.
1925	Rev. R. N. Burns, D.D.
1926	Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick, Hon. A.D.C.
1927	Col. Alexander Fraser, LL.D.,. AD.C.*
1928	Robert Fennell, Esq.
1929	Hugh Eayrs, Esq.
1930	John D. Spence, K.C.
1931	H. G. Stapells, Esq.
1932-33	Lt.-Col. Geo. A. Drew, V.D., A.D.C.
1933-34	Major W. Jas. Baxter, M.C.
1934-35	Dana H. Porter, Esq.

* Deceased.

CONSTITUTION

INSTITUTED 1903

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1, The organization shall be called the Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the Club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1 for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The Membership of the Club shall consist of

(a) Active Resident Members,
(b) Non-Resident Members,
(c) Life Members,
(d) Honorary Members,
(e) Associate Members.

All members must be of the full age of sixteen years, and members of classes a, b, c and d must be British subjects.

Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Members

Art. 3.—(1) Candidates for Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

(2) Subject to sub-section 4 of this article active resident and associate members shall pay an annual fee of $4.00 and non-resident members $3.00, payable on the first day of October in each year in respect of the Club year from May 1 to April 30 then current. Payment of such fees shall entitle each member to receive a copy of

the Year Book. No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered in good standing or be eligible for office.

(3) Associate members shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

(4) Members whose applications for membership are received after the first day of April in any year shall pay one annual fee only in respect of the period from that time till the 30th day of April in the following calendar year.

(5) In the year 1934-1935 active resident and associate members who have paid their fees to December 31st, 1934, shall be allowed a credit of $1.00 upon their fees for the year ending April 30, 1935. Non-resident members shall be allowed a credit of 75c.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life Members shall pay a fee of $50.00 in one sum.

Art. 5.—(1) Honorary Members may be elected upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Officers to be Elected

Art. 6.—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and

Third Vice-Presidents; a Treasurer, a Secretary, or a Secretary-Treasurer; the Executive Committee shall consist of these officers and 17 other members who with the officers shall be elected by ballot, and of the ex-officio members hereinafter mentioned. All Past Presidents shall constitute an Advisory Council under the Chairmanship of the immediate Past President and such Advisory Council shall elect annually three members, who, together with the retiring President, shall be the ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The Election of Officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members, to be held not later than April 15 of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. And the officers and Executive Committee then elected shall hold office till April 30, of the following year, and thereafter until their successors respectively have been duly elected and installed. A committee to nominate the officers for the new year shall be appointed at a regular or special meeting to be held not less than four, and not more than six weeks before such Annual Meeting, due notice of such meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such committee shall report to the Annual Meeting; provided that no member shall be nominated to any office unless and until he has given notice in writing that he consents to such nomination and will act if elected to the position for which he has been nominated.

(3) Two Auditors shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committees

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows:—

(*a*) Finance Committee.
(*b*) Speakers' Committee.

(*c*) Membership Committee.
(*d*) Constitution Committee.
(*e*) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
(*f*) Publicity Committee.
(*g*) Royal Colonial Institute Committee.

Filling of Vacancies Among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly from October to May, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermissions as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. The Treasurer shall, in addition to the interim report presented at the Annual Meeting, present an audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year at a regular meeting of the Club held during the month of May.

Notice of Meetings

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11.—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual or special and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Six members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the addresses and notices of motion shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its aproval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year of the Club shall begin on the first day of May in each year and end on the thirtieth day of April in the year following.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15.—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two-thirds majority vote of the members present.

LIFE AND HONORARY MEMBERS

Borden, Sir R. L.
Bruce, Hon. Dr. Herbert A.

Clouse, Dr. Elias
Coombs, F. J.
Crowther, W. C.

Fetherstonhaugh, F. B., K.C.
Fraser, Col. Alexander

Gibbons, John J.
Goggin, Dr. D. J.

Ham, Dr. Albert
Hewitt, Arthur

Kernahan, W. T.

MacDougall, A. Roy
MacKay, John
MacKendrick, Col. W. G.
McWhinney, W. J., K.C.
Murdoch, James Y.

Pellatt, Sir H. W.
Perry, J. B.

Scythes, J. A.
Stapells, H. G.
Stapells, R. A.
Stewart, J. F. M.
Stuart, Lt.-Col. R. J.
Sweeney, Rt. Rev. James F.

Tindall, H. B.

Wood, E. R.

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Abbs, Chas. E.
Adams, A. A.
Adams, G. W.
Agar, Norman E.
Aird, Sir John
Aird, W. H.
Aitchison, J. F.
Allen, Dr. David W.
Allen, Geo. H.
Alley, B. P.
Alley, Lt.-Col. Herbert R.
Allin, R. W.
Allnutt, Rev. F. B.
Ambrose, J. R. W.
Amos, Alfred A.
Anderson, Dr. H. B.
Andison, T. H.
Anglin, Sydney E.
Appleton, C. N.
Archdekin, W. O.
Archibald, Dr. T. D.
Argue, Wm. L.
Armour, Rev. J. B. M.
Armstrong, J. S. P.
Arneil, W. S.
Arnott, John P.
Ashlin, C. H. N.
Ashton, T. L.
Ashworth, E. M.
Aspden, T. F.
Atkinson, Fred.
Atkinson, L. R.
Aykroyd, M. J.

Babbitt, G. W.
Bainard, R. H.
Baird, J. M.
Baker, Geo. A.
Baldwin, H. A.
Baldwin, L. H.
Balfour, Major G. B., K.C.
Ballard, B. W.
Barber, Geo.
Barlow, F. H., K.C.
Barnard, A. W.
Bastedo, Norman H.
Baxter, Major W. James
Baynes-Reed, Rev. Canon W. L.

Beairsto, A. H. C.
Bealey, Ernest R.
Beatty, C. G.
Beatty, E. P.
Beatty, Dr. H. A.
Becker, Dr. C. W.
Begg, Herbert
Belden, Dr. G. F.
Bell, H. Brooke
Bell, T. H.
Bennet, David D.
Bennett,, E. J.
Berkeley, H. C.
Best, T. Harrison
Bethel, Frank
Biggar, Dr. J. L.
Binns, P. W.
Birkenshaw, J. H.
Bishop, Col. A. L.
Bishop, G.
Bishop, H. H.
Blackburn, D. D.
Blackburn, F. J.
Blachford, F. A.
Blackstock, Col. G. G.
Blackwell, B. S.
Blaikie, Ross W.
Bland, S. G.
Bogert, C. A.
Bolger, H. N.
Bongard, Gordon R.
Bongard, R. R.
Bonnell, W. H. M.
Bourlier, H. C.
Boyce, J. F.
Boyd, Mossom De G.
Brace, G. A.
Brace, J. H.
Bradshaw, Thomas
Brathwaite, F. Y. W.
Breithaupt, W. W.
Brigden, Geo.
Brittain, Horace L.
Brook, Arthur T.
Brooke, George H.
Brooks, W.
Broughall, Rev. Canon J. S.
Brown, A. T.
Brown, F. D.
Brown, F. H.
Brown, F. I.
Brown, Henry
Brown, W. E.
Browne, James
Bryce, Robt. A.
Bryson, R. N.
Burgess, C. H.
Burgess, F. A.
Burns, H. D.
Burns, Rev. Dr. R. N.
Burt, A. W.
Burton, C. L.
Burton, E. G.

Cairns, W. J.
Calvert, A. Morrison
Cameron, Harry
Cameron, Capt. J. D.
Cameron, John D.
Cameron, M. C.
Cameron, W. A.
Campbell, Dr. Colin A.
Campbell, G. C.
Canon, W. J.
Carleton, Ed. M.
Carlisle, C. H.
Carr, W. D.
Carr, Harris, Major R. R.
Carradus, Capt. H. R.
Carrie, Nichol
Carruthers, Geo.
Carruthers, Geo. L.
Carter, F. C.
Carter, J. Smyth
Carthy, Dr. W. C.
Cartwright, Brig.-Gen. G. S.
Cassidy, H. F.
Caulder, J. A.
Caven, Dr. W. R.
Chalmers, Floyd S.
Chandler, Harry S.
Chapeau, Arthur C.
Charles, Leo. E.
Chave, B. W.
Cherry, P. G.
Chipman, J. H.

Chisholm, Lt.-Col. Geo. T.
Christie, W. B.
Clapperton, H. G.
Clark, C. T.
Clark, Dr. Harold
Clark, Herbert A., K.C.
Clark, Hugh W.
Clark, Dr. W. J.
Clarkson, R.
Clendenan, Dr. G. W.
Cliff, Geo. J.
Close, T. B.
Clouse, F. L.
Coatsworth, Alan
Cody, Canon H. J.
Coke, Major E. F.
Colby, S. A.
Colebrook, H. G.
Colquhoun, C. M.
Colwell, C. A. Edward
Conochie, J. H.
Cooper, R. J.
Cork, J. Milton
Corlett, W. E.
Corson, R. R.
Cosgrave, Provost F. H.
Coste, E. F.
Coulter, J. E.
Coulter, W. C.
Coulter, W. Howard
Cowan, N. E.
Cowan, Major R. Cecil
Cragg, Shirley R.
Craick, W. A.
Craig, T. A.
Crang, J. H.
Creighton, A. H.
Crighton, A. S.
Crocket, E.
Crossland, E. F.
Crowell, Samuel G.
Crawford-Brown, Lyman

Cutten, L. F.
Daly, R. A.
Daly, Roland O.
Dalziel, Col. Wm. R.
Dargavel, R. B.
Davies, J. E.
Davies, M. L.
Davis, Bertram N.
Davis, Bruce P.
Davis, Geo. D.
Davis R. Reade
Davis, W. H.
Day, Major Bernhard
Deacon, Col. F. H.
Dean, Rev. S. W.
Dean, W. G.
Defoe, C. W.
DeGuerre, H. W.
Dempsey, H. D.
Denne, A. J.
Denton, Frank
DeVries, Henry M.
DeWitt, H. N.
DeWitt, N. W.
Dickson, Rev. Geo. A.
Dilworth, F. J.
Dilworth, W. A.
Dingle, Gordon R. M.
Dingman, H. J.
Dixon, Rev. John H.
Doan, A. K.
Doherty, Hon. Manning W.
Donaldson, Geo.
Donaldson, G. R.
Douglas, Howard R.
Douglas, J. S.
Drayton, Sir Henry
Drew, Lt.-Col. Geo. A.
Drew, John
Drummond, H. A.
Duffet, Norman G.
Duggan, R. B.
Duncan, E. H.
Duncan, E. J. B.
Duncan, S. F.
Dunkelman, D.
Dunn, William
Dunstan, Kenneth J.
Dyke, Jas. E.

Eastmure, A. W.
Eaton, R. Y.
Eayrs, Hugh S.
Eby, H. D.
Edge, Alfred
Edmonds, Geo.
Edwards, A. Geoffrey
Edwards, H. Percy
Edwards, Oswald Noel
Elgie, G. C.
Elliott, L.
Ellis, J. F.
Ellis, M. L.
Ellis, Matthew T.
Ellsworth, A. L.
Elton, J. O.
Ely, E. F.
Evans, Arthur C.

Fairweather, R. H.
Falconer, H. W.
Falconer, Sir Robt.
Fallis, Col. Geo. O.
Fennell, Robt. H.
Ferguson, B. H.
Ferguson, H. M.
Ferguson, John
Ferguson, M.
Fisher, A. B.
Fishman, P.
Fitch, P. F.
Fitzgerald, D. G.
Flavelle, Sir Joseph
Fleming, Atwell Jr.
Fleming, Donald M.
Fleming, G. O.
Fleming, J. W.
Flynn, J.
Forrester, David W.
Forrester, W. J.
Fortner, C. H.
Forster, J. W. L.
Foster, R. Leighton
Fowler, Paul S.
Fox, E. D.
Fox, W. Claude
Frame, S. J.
Francis, G. C.
Frankel, Roy H.
Freyseng, Edward J.
Frost, Harold R.
Fry, H.
Fulford, R. T.

Gale, Geo. C.
Gale, R. H.
Gay, John R.
Geary, Capt. B. Handley, V.C.
Gianelli, Chevalier V.
Gibbons, Alan O.
Gibson, D. H.
Gibson, Wm. Robt.
Gilchrist, Prof. Lachlan
Giles, T. S. H.
Gilmour, A. H.
Gillespie, James
Glennie, Geo. H.
Goff, John B.
Goldberg, A. M. P.
Gooderham, A. E., Jr.
Gooderham, E. D.
Gooderham, Geo. H.
Gooding, T. W.
Gordon, A. B.
Gordon, T. A.
Gordon, W. Lockhart
Gordon, Wm. E.
Gowdy, D. M.
Graham, Wilson
Grant, D. E.
Grant, W. G. F.
Grasett, S.
Greene, A. R.
Gresham, G. E.
Grier, A. Monro
Griffiths, F. D.
Griffin, R. H.
Grills, T. O.
Guest, A. E.
Guilfoyle, H. E.
Gullen, Dr. J. B.
Gundy, J. H.
Gundy, S. B.
Gunn, Edmond
Gunn, Brig.-Gen. John A.

Haig, J. McD.
Hair, Dr. C. H.
Hales, James
Hall, Albert C.
Hall, F. M.
Hall, I. C.
Ham, C. N.
Hambly, Geo.
Hamilton, A. E.
Hamilton, C. S.
Hamilton, Grey, K.C.
Hamilton, H. K.
Hamilton, John
Hamilton, R. S.
Hamilton, W. E.
Hamlin, Dr. Fred V.
Hammell, J. E.
Hanna, J. B.
Harcourt, R. M.
Hardy, H. R.
Hargraft, Geo. N.
Hargraft, L. G.
Hargraft, W. M.
Harman, John H. M.
Harris, F. S.
Harris, Jos. H.
Harris, Wm. W.
Harling, R. Dawson
Harpham, Horace
Hart, Norman G.
Hart, W. T.
Harvey, D. W.
Harvey, E. J.
Harvey, Dr. W. J.
Haskel, Arthur R.
Hastings, C. E.
Hastings, Warren B.
Hatch, A. E.
Hawke, Eugene
Hawkins, Dr. Chas. S.
Hawthorne, J. D.
Hay, Frank
Hay, Ruthven
Hearst, Sir Wm.
Heaven, W. J.
Heintzman, Charles T.
Heintzman, G. B.
Heintzman, Geo. C.
Henderson, Robert
Hendrie, Geo. C.
Henwood, H. B.
Herbinson, Wm.
Herington, Gordon
Hermant, Percy
Hern, Rev. Gordon
Herod, Wesley J.
Heron, T. Earl
Hetherington, Major E. A.
Hewitt, Gordon W.
Hewson, E. G.
Higgins, Fred Page
Hill, F. W. J.
Hill, Roy C.
Hobbs, Geo.
Hobkirk, John F.
Hoblitzell, Fred G.
Hobson, Arthur
Hodgeman, M. S.
Hoidge, W. H.
Holliss, J. F.
Holmested, G. S.
Honan, James
Hooper, Lt.-Col. B. O.
Hopkins, Percy E.
Hoppe, O.
Horwood, J. C. B.
Horton, C. W.
Houghton, E. J.
Houghton, E. O.
Houston, H. C.
Howard, Clifford H.
Howe, C. D.
Howe, H. J.
Howes, Joseph E.
Howse, Thos. H.
Huckvale, Robert
Hudson, T. C.
Huestis, Rev. C. H.
Hughes, Glenholme
Hughes, S. A.
Hugill, Albert E.
Hugill, W. M.
Hull, W. V.
Humphrey, Dr. John N.
Humphreys, W. Eason

Humphries, G. W.
Hunter, B. B.
Hunter, Lt.-Col. F. Fraser
Hunter, H. T.
Huston, E. T.
Huston, J. A.
Hutchinson, Morton C.
Hutchison, O. A.

Ignatieff, Nicholas
Inglis, Wm.
Ingram, H. S.
Irving, T. T.

Jackman, H. R.
Jackson, E. H.
Jackson, Thomas D.
Jacob, E. R.
Jaffray, W. G.
Jamieson, H. T.
Jamieson, John D.
Jaquith, Dr. L. E.
Jardine, Wm.
Jardine, T. S.
Jarvis, H. St. J.
Jarvis, Norman S.
Jefferis, C. A.
Jennings, P. H.
Jephcott, Dr. C. M.
Jephcott, Gerald
Johnson, C. E.
Johnson, D. O.
Johnson, George H.
Johnson, John
Johnson, Main
Johnston, Col. Baptist
Johnston, Erskine B.
Johnston, R. B.
Johnston, Dr. Samuel
Jones, A. W.
Jones, G. J. L.
Jones, J. Erle
Jones, Sydney H.
Jones, T. Roy
Junkin, Major L.

Kee, H. A.
Kellam, Geo. M.
Kemp, Dr. S. W.
Kerr, Rev. J. McD.
Kerr, John E.
Kerr, W. E.
Keys, Prof. D. R.
Kidd, Hon. T. Ashmore
Kilbourn, K. M.
Kilgour, R. C.
Kingsland, W. A.
Kingsmill, Col. W. B.
Kinsman, J. Victor
Kirkpatrick, Col. A. E.
Kirkpatrick, A. M. M.
Kirkpatrick, W. R.
Kirschmann, A. N.
Knight, Cyril W.
Knight, Norman
Knowlton, Thos E.

Laidlaw, John B.
LaBine, Chas.
Lamb, Col. H. J.
Lamb, John R.
Lamont, W. H.
Lang, Jas.
Langmuir, A. W.
Larrington, Arthur
Lascelles, G. A.
Laughton, H. V.
Laut, Wallace J.
Lavine, Arthur
Lawson, Hon. J. Earl
Lawson, Wm. D.
Lea, Herbert
Ledger, W. R.
Lee, H. T. L.
Lee, Lawlor
Leibel, Wm.
Lemon, W. E.
Leonard, T. D'Arcy
Leslie, Robt. R.
LeSueur, R. V.
Lindsay, W. W.
Linnell, A. P.
Lister, M. Parker
Little, Wm.
Livesay, J. F.
Livingstone, J. A.

Lloyd, T. E.
Locke, Clarke
Locke, Dr. Geo. H.
Logan, C. S.
Long, Clinton E.
Lount, H. M.
Lovering, Egerton
Lovering, W. L.
Loveys, Geo. C.
Lucas, F. O.
Lucas, I. B.
Lyon, L. S.
Lyon, O. T.

Macabe, Thos. J.
MacAlpine, Col. C. D. H.
Macaulay, Hon. Leopold
MacBeth, John C.
MacBrien, W. A. H.
MacDonald, Charlton
Macdonald, C. S.
Macdonald, E.
Macdonald, Hugh
MacFadyen, W. T. A.
MacFarlane, E. S.
MacKay, G. F. A.
MacKay, Col. J. Keiller
MacKenzie, D. R.
MacKinnon, J. Bruce
MacLachlan, Wills
MacLaren, J. F.
MacLaren, Ian
MacLean, Hugh C.
MacLean, Col. J. B.
MacLeod, J. K.
MacMillan, Dr. R. J.
MacQuarrie, Donald R.
Macrae, A. Montye
Macrae, E. M.
Madill, Rev. A. S.
Magi, M. I.
Magladery, W.
Malcolm, C. S.
Mallison, Fred.
Mancantelli, Robt.
Manley, Jas. P.
Marsh, F. Hedley
Marsh, W. H.
Marshall, Col. K. R.
Marshall, Dr. T. R.
Martin, J. H.
Masse, O.
Massey, F. Vernon
Massey, Denton
Matthews, A. B.
Matthews, Arnold C.
Matthews, W. Donald
Matthews, F. B.
Matthews, James G.
Matthews, Hon. R. C.
Maunsell, J. Q.
Maxwell, John
Maybee, J. Edward
McAdam, S.
McAll, H. W.
McBain, Alex.
McBride, James
McCarthy, Leighton
McClain, John W.
McClelland, D. McK.
McCloskey, H. C.
McCollum, Dr. J. A.
McConnell, Dr. J. H.
McCoubrey, J. W.
McCoy, D. B.
McCoy, G. E.
McCraw, D. F.
McCrea, Hon. Chas.
McCrea, John M.
McCrea, T. Arthur
McCrimmon, D. A.
McCulley, Jos.
McCollough, J. W.
McDonagh, Dr. A. J.
McDonell, T. E.
McDowell, Geo.
McEachran, Wm. T.
McElheran, Rev. Dr. R. B.
McEwen, G. C.
McGarry, F. A.
McGaw, T. D.
McGee, Col. H.
McGillivray, M. W.
McGillivray, T. A.

McIntosh, A. N.
McIntyre, K.
McKeown, S. W.
McKinley, Dr. J. N.
McKinnon, Neil J.
McKinnon, W. L.
McKnight, M.
McLeod, D. I.
McLeod, Geo. J.
McLeod, J. A.
McLeod, W. N.
McMahon, F.
McMillan, Norman
McMillan, John B.
McMullen, Robt.
McMurray, Leonard L.
McNair, C.
McNeill, E. W.
McNeillie, Geo. G.
McPherson, R. S.
McWhinney, J. M.
McWilliams, C. E. P.
McWilliams, D. B.
McWilliams, M. H.
Medland, John
Medland, T. J.
Meek, M. H.
Mellish, A. E.
Merchant, Dr. F. W.
Meredith, C. H.
Merrick, D. A. Y.
Merry, Martin N.
Mess, Lt.-Col. James
Messenger, L. E.
Middleton, A. N.
Miles, Arthur W.
Millar, J. C.
Millar, W. E.
Miller, Andrew
Miller, P. C.
Mills, C. A.
Mitchell, A. N.
Mitchell, Brig.-Gen. C. H.
Mitchell, B. L.
Mitchell, C. S. F.
Mitchell, J. W.
Mitchell, L. W.
Mitchell, Wm. G.
Mitchell, Lt.-Col. W. G.
Moffat, W. R.
Montgomery, Jos.
Monypenny, T. F.
Moore, F.
Moore, H. Napier
Moore, R. C.
Moore, S. J.
Morgan, J.
Morine, Sir Alfred
Morine, A. Nevill
Morley, R. B.
Morris, Alex. C.
Morrow, F. K.
Morrow, Graham
Morrow, G. A.
Moysey, Arthur E.
Mulholland, Fred. A.
Mulqueen, F. J.
Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.
Mulock, Wm. P.
Munn, Chas. H.
Munnoch, Gordon R.
Muntz, G. H.
Murphy, Edward J.
Murphy, Jos.
Murphy, J. A.
Murphy, M. P.
Murray, Rev. J. Lovell
Murray, Joseph
Muskett, H. W.
Musson, C. J.
Mutch, C. M.

Nash, Major A. E.
Nash, Gerald
Naylor, W. S.
Naylor, W. W.
Needham, C. F.
Needham, R. J.
Neelands, E. V.
Neil, Bertram
Neilly, Balmer
Newman, Hy. A.
Newton, B. G.
Nicholls, Samuel G.

Nicholson, H. A.
Nicholson, Jas.
Nimmo, Bruce D.
Nixon, C. M.
Nixon, W. G.
Noble, Wilfred G.
Northey, R. K.
Norton, T. W. F.

O'Brian, R. B.
O'Brien, G. E.
Olver, E. A.
Osborne, Col. J. Ewart
Osborne, R. J.
Osler, F. G.
Osler, Glyn
Ostrom, W. R.
Owen, Most Rev. Derwyn T.

Page, Wm. A.
Pakes, S. A.
Parker, Dr. Chas. B.
Parker, Robt.
Parkinson, N. F.
Parmenter, R. H.
Partridge, A. G.
Patrick, W. G.
Patten, Henry C.
Patterson, C. S.
Patterson, H. F.
Patterson, J. P.
Patteson, J. C.
Payne, Jas.
Peachey, E. H.
Pearce, R. John
Pearson, J. A.
Pearson, John
Peckover, Cecil R.
Pember, W. T.
Pepall, Geo. T.
Perry, Geo. D.
Perry, H. M.
Petman, Robt.
Pettipiere, R.
Pettit, Godfrey S.
Phillips, Nathan
Phillips, William
Philpott, W. M.
Phipps, A. E.
Pike, Theodore
Plant, W. H.
Playter, W. P.
Pocklington, Wilfred
Porter, D. H.
Porter, Dr. Geo. D.
Potter, Chas. Ed.
Powell, H. F.
Powley, J.
Pratt, J. P., K.C.
Prentice, Victor F.
Price, Lt.-Col. W. H.
Pringle, J. F.
Proctor, A. H. C.
Pullen, Frank
Pullan, Harry
Pym, R. N.

Rabjohn, R. H.
Rae, Robt.
Raney, Fraser
Rathbun, L. M.
Reaves, Campbell
Reburn, E. T.
Reburn, H.
Reed, Edwin T.
Reed, Col. LeGrand
Reid, A. M.
Reid, Fraser D.
Reid, Loftus H.
Reid, Dr. Spence
Renfrew, Allen E.
Rennie, Thomas
Renison, Bishop R. J.
Richardson, Joseph
Richardson, Robt. D.
Riddle, W. C.
Ringland, H. S.
Roberts, Major A. Kelso
Roberts, Sir Charles G. D.
Roberts, C. Percy
Roberts, F. E.
Roberts, H. A. D.
Robertson, C. E.
Robertson, Major Charles A.
Robertson, C. S.
Robertson, Douglas S.

Robertson, Duncan
Robertson, N. S.
Robertson, R. A.
Robertson, W. E.
Robertson, W. G.
Robins, Col. F. B.
Robinson, Dr. T. A.
Rogers, G. H.
Rogerson, J. G.
Rollason, W. E.
Rolph, F. A.
Rose, F. W.
Ross, Bruce D.
Ross, Hon. W. D.
Rotenburg, Harry
Routley, F. S.
Rowan, Donald H.
Rowell, Hon. N. W., K.C.
Rowland, Henry A.
Rowland, W. Alex.
Rowley, Col. C. W.
Ruddy, E. L.
Russell, T. A.
Ruttan, Col. C. M.

Sachs, Rabbi Samuel
St. Lawrence, F.
Salter, W. R.
Sandham, E. A.
Sandwell, B. K.
Saunders, E. M.
Sawers, Rev. Canon F. J.
Scales, C. H.
Scandrett, J. H.
Scheuer, Edmund
Schiff, Emile
Schurman, C. D.
Scott, S. C.
Scott, W. S.
Scroggie, Geo. E.
Seagram, J. W.
Seitz, Ernest
Seitz, J. J.
Selby, Reginald
Selby, W. T. H.
Sexsmith, J. Alex.
Shannon, Frank
Shapley, W. H.
Sherring, J. B.
Shields, C. B.
Shier, Dr. R. V. B.
Sifton, Major Clifford
Simpson, Jas. I.
Sinclair, Neil
Singer, J. G.
Smallpiece, V. N.
Smith, A. L.
Smith, C. P.
Smith, F. D. L.
Smith, H. M.
Smith, Paul L.
Smith, Victor A.
Smoke, A. L.
Smythe, Col. R. E.
Snider, C. H. J.
Sommerville, Norman, K.C.
Sommerville, Wm. E.
Southall, H. L.
Sparrow, J. M.
Spence, J. D., K.C.
Springett, Rev. E. J.
Squire, S. L.
Stanford, F. T.
Stanley, J. N.
Stanley, Richard T.
Stephenson, Dr. F. C.
Stephenson, H. R.
Stewart, A. G.
Stewart, Alan E.
Stewart, D.
Stewart, D. K.
Stewart, John W. W.
Stewart, R. T.
Stewart, W. Dunlop
Stewart, Wm. J.
Stillwell, Rev. Dr. H. E.
Stoddart, W. H.
Strachan, James
Stubington, Godfrey
Stupart, Sir Fred.
Suydam, J. C.

Tate, H. W.
Taylor, E. Geo. T.
Taylor, E. P.
Taylor, J. G.
Taylor, Jos.

Taylor, W. D.
Teakle, R. B.
Tedman, Harry M.
Thom, Kenneth
Thomas, D. A.
Thompson, E. F.
Thompson, Geo. W.
Thompson, Gordon V.
Thompson, J. W.
Thomson, H. G.
Tidy, Major Frank O.
Tisdall, Chas. P.
Tolchard, F. D.
Topping, Victor
Torrance, R. D.
Tory, John A.
Tovell, Dr. H. M.
Toye, Eldred D.
Tucker, Edward J.
Tugwell, H. C.
Turner, E. H.
Turner, H. R.
Turner, James
Turner, T. O.
Tuteur, M. P.
Twiss, B. A.
Tyrell, H. V.
Tyrell, Wm.
Tyrrell, E. C.

Van Blaricom, G. B.
Van Koughnet, Arthur
Van Lane, J. F.
Vaughan, J. J.
Venables, Francis G.
Verral, Geo. W.
Von Maur, Jacob D.

Wadsworth, R. B.
Waldie, Kemp
Waldie, R. S.
Walker, B. G.
Walker, Charles
Walker, E. B.
Walker, H. C.
Wallace, H. LeRoy
Wallace, Malcolm W.
Walmsley, John L.
Walmsley, Joseph
Walsh, Fred T.
Walsh, J. E.
Ward, Rev. James E.
Wardlaw, T. D.
Warren, Dr. C. A.
Warren, F. A.
Warren, Harold D.
Warwick, Geo. R.
Warwick, R. D.
Watson, G. F.
Watson, H. E. G.
Watson, J. Graeme
Watson, J. P.
Watson, T. H.
Watson, W. B.
Watson, W. G.
Watson, Col. W. H.
Watson, Dr. W. V.
Watt, J. L.
Webster, A. Guy
Webster, Howard
Welsh, Frank
Werlich, Angus A.
Westman, A. E. R.
Weston, J. F.
Westren, J.
Wetherell, J. E.
Wheatley, E.
White, Frank W.
White, H. A.
White, Sir Thomas
Whitehead, J. H.
Whiteley, J.
Whittingham, Major H.
Wildblood, Geo. W.
Wilkes, F. Hilton
Wilkinson, E. H.
Williams, A. W.
Williams, H. H.
Williams, Robt. J.
Williams, R. J.
Willinsky, Dr. A. I.
Willoughby, J. A.
Wills, Harold A.

Wilson, Arthur M.
Woodcock, Rev. Canon H. F. D.
Woodland, C. W. I.
Woods, Damon C.
Wright, E. F.
Wright, L. V.
Wilson, C. Leslie
Wilson, Geo.
Wilson, G. D.
Wilson, John
Wilson, W. G.
Winchell, L. F.
Winter, L. A.
Wolfenden, Hugh H.
Wood, F. P.
Wood, L. M.

Young, Frank
Young, John A.
Young, J. B.

Zinkan, Dr. E. I.

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Baker, Robert P.
Beaumont, Jos.
Boxer, Reginald N.
Bradley, E.
Burge, Glyn R.

Cawthra-Elliott, Maj.-Gen. H. M.
Cockerham, Robt.

Grainger, A. H.

Hamilton, W. E.
Hughes, Gordon R.

Lovell, E. A.

McLaughlin, Col. R. S.
McLean, W. A.

Over, Spencer Henry

Ponton, Col W. N.

Raven, Rev. C. C.
Richardson, Dr. R. N. C.

Shergold, Lt.-Col. C.
Silverthorn, Gideon
Sinclair, Dr. D. J.
Smith, A. St. Albans
Smith, W. Harland
Somerville, J. N.
Steele, C. E.
Stirling, Wm. T.

Taylor, R. F.
Torrance, R. L.

Vincent, J.

Whidden, Dr. Howard P.
Wideman, Albert
Wideman, Harvey
Wills, R. Dean